

# CHURCH HISTORY

The Birth of the Free Church of Scotland

by James Buchanan

Papal Primacy and Disobedience

Part II, 1815-1871

by H. E. James

Horatio Oliver, M.A., F.R.S.

Churchman and Statesman

by G. B. Baker

The Pilgrimage of St. James

by R. B. Dobson

A Review of the Pilgrimage of St. James

THE AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

# THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFY, 1890; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT  
OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916.

## OFFICERS FOR 1937

H. Stephen Smith	President	Robert S. Mielckson	Asst. Sec.
George H. Williams	Vice-President	Guy S. Klett	Treasurer
Winthrop S. Hudson	Secretary	J. E. Nichols	Editors
(Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York)		Frederick A. Norwood	

## OTHER VOTING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Sandford Fleeting	Quirinus Breen
Sidney E. Mead	Robert T. Handy
Carl E. Schneider	Jerald C. Brauer
Leonard J. Tristram	Harold J. Grimes

## ADVISORY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Henry B. Washburn	Roland H. Bainton
William Walter Hallford	E. R. Hardy, Jr.
Winifred E. Garrison	Harold S. Bender
William Warren Sweet	Percy V. Norwood
Conrad H. Moellmann	Kenneth S. Latourette
Frederick W. Lonsdale	Matthew Spinks
John T. McNell	Cyril W. Richardson
Wilhelm Fuchs	Ernest G. Schwiebert
Massey H. Shepherd	Ray C. Petry

Subscription prices are five dollars a year, one dollar and a half for single copies. Twenty-five cents a year should be added for foreign countries. Remittances should be made to the order of the American Society of Church History. Subscriptions, renewals, changes of address, claims for missing numbers, orders for single copies of current or back issues should be addressed to Guy S. Klett, Presbyterian Historical Society, 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania. Claims for missing numbers will be honored without charge if made within two months following the regular month of publication.

Manuscripts and books for review should be sent to the editorial office, 306 Swift Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago 27, Ill.

The articles in *Church History* are indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Microfilm reproductions of *Church History*, beginning with Volume XVIII, are available to subscribers and to members of the Society from University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Publication Office is in Berlin, Indiana.

Entered as second class under March 9, 1934, at the post-office at Berlin, Indiana, under the Acts of March 3, 1879.

# CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD  
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON ( <i>Divinity School, Yale University</i> )	RAY C. PETRY ( <i>Divinity School, Duke University</i> )
R. PIERCE BEAVER ( <i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i> )	MATTHEW SPINKA ( <i>Hartford Theological Seminary</i> )
ROBERT GRANT ( <i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i> )	WILHELM PAUCK ( <i>Union Theological Seminary</i> )
WINTHROP S. HUDSON ( <i>Colgate-Rochester Divinity School</i> )	JOHN DILLENBERGER ( <i>Divinity School, Harvard University</i> )
SIDNEY E. MEAD ( <i>Meadville Theological School</i> )	EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. ( <i>McCormick Theological Seminary</i> )

VOL. XXVI

JUNE, 1957

No. 2

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE BIRTH OF THE FREE CHURCH TRADITION <i>James Fulton Maclear</i>	99
PAPAL FINANCE AND THE TEMPORAL POWER, 1815-1871 <i>Rondo E. Cameron</i>	132
HORATIO OLIVER LADD: A NEW ENGLAND CONSCIENCE FOR NEW MEXICO <i>Frederick G. Bohme</i>	143
THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHURCH FATHERS. <i>By Harry Austryn Wolfson: A Review Article.</i> <i>George Huntson Williams</i>	156
SURVEY: MEDIEVAL CHURCH HISTORY	169
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS	174
BOOK REVIEWS	178
STAUFFER, ETHELBERT: <i>Christ and the Caesars</i> .....	Samuel Laeuchli
BETTENSON, HENRY (Editor and translator): <i>The Early Christian Fathers. A Selection from the writings of the Fathers from St. Clement of Rome to St. Athanasius</i> .....	Robert M. Grant

# CONTENTS

ISTAVRIDIS, VASIL T.: <i>Theological Education in the Alexandrian School</i> .....	John E. Rexine
TAVARD, GEORGE H.: <i>Transiency and Permanence. The Nature of Theology According to St. Bonaventure</i> .....	William O'Meara
RUNCIMAN, STEVEN: <i>The Eastern Schism. A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches During the XIth and XIIth Centuries</i> .....	Georges Florovsky
ARNOLD, HUGH: <i>Stained Glass of the Middle Ages in England and France</i> .....	Otto G. von Simson
TIERNEY, BRIAN: <i>The Foundations of Conciliar Theory</i> ....	John T. McNeill
PETRY, RAY C.: <i>Christian Eschatology and Social Thought</i> .....	Martin Anton Schmidt
NORWOOD, FREDERICK, A.: <i>The Development of Modern Christianity</i> .....	Richard C. Wolf
<i>The Mennonite Encyclopedia</i> .....	Roland H. Bainton
SIMPSON, ALAN: <i>Puritanism in Old and New England</i> .....	J. F. Maclear
SCHULTZ, HOWARD: <i>Milton and Forbidden Knowledge</i> .....	Ernest Sirluck
PREUS, ROBERT: <i>The Inspiration of Scripture</i> .....	Jaroslav Pelikan
SPENER, PHILIPP JACOB: <i>Pia Desideria</i>	
FRITZ, W. (Editor): <i>Quellen zum Wormser Konkordat</i> .....	Robert H. Fischer
DE MENDIETA, EMMANUEL AMAND: <i>La Presqu'île des Caloyers: le Mont-Athos</i> .....	Georges Florovsky
DIONYSIATOS, THEOKLËTOS: <i>Between Heaven and Earth (Holy Mount Monasticism)</i> .....	John E. Rexine
BULLOCK, F. W. B.: <i>A History of Training for the Ministry of the Church of England, 1800-1874</i> .....	Daniel D. Williams
LOVELAND, CLARA O.: <i>The Critical Years</i> .....	Nelson R. Burr
SCHAUINGER, J. HERMAN: <i>Stephen T. Badin. Priest in the Wilderness</i> .....	John Tracy Ellis
PETERS, JOHN L.: <i>Christian Perfection and American Methodism. The Wesleyan Doctrine—Its Development and Deviations</i> .....	Timothy L. Smith
STROUPE, HENRY SMITH: <i>The Religious Press in the South Atlantic States, 1802-1865: An Annotated Bibliography with Historical Introduction and Notes</i> .....	Gaylord P. Albaugh
FORBUSH, BLISS: <i>Elias Hicks, Quaker Liberal</i> .....	Hugh Barbour
SCHIEFFMAN, JOSEPH (Editor, with an Introduction): <i>Edward Bellamy: Selected Writings on Religion and Society</i> .....	Albert E. Stone, Jr.
BLIED, REVEREND BENJAMIN J.: <i>Three Archbishops of Milwaukee, Michael Heiss (1818-1890), Frederick Katzer (1844-1903), Sebastian Messmer (1847-1930)</i> .....	Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C.
UMBLE, JOHN: <i>Goshen College, 1894-1954—A Venture in Christian Higher Education</i> .....	Emmet Eklund
MAXWELL, WILLIAM D.: <i>A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland</i> .....	Bard Thompson
SPINKA, MATTHEW: <i>The Church in Soviet Russia</i> .....	Harold P. Ford



## THE BIRTH OF THE FREE CHURCH TRADITION

JAMES FULTON MACLEAR, *University of Minnesota—Duluth*

The free church form which much of British and American Protestantism has assumed stems primarily from the shaping of Nonconformity in seventeenth-century England. Yet the uniqueness and significance of this origin have not always been appreciated. These English and American churches have a basis distinct from that of the free churches which arose on the Continent in the nineteenth century. For unlike the latter, the free churches of Nonconformity developed within the fabric of Christian state and society and not out of any fundamental ideological conflict with secularized authority. Again, in England and America the free church form was molded in the unique environment of religious multiplicity which Puritan divisions produced. Consequently, it was as difficult for any religious group to respond to this environment in the classical sectarian pattern as for churchly institutions to maintain pretensions to uniformity—a fact which even church historians, impressed by Troeltsch's church-sect dichotomy, have been slow to recognize. And lastly, in both England and America the free church would seem to have been shaped by certain axioms of Puritan thought and piety. Indeed, this essay seeks to show that Puritanism both produced the problem and suggested the alternatives out of which the final free church concepts emerged.

These characteristics make it possible to use a special term in speaking of this type of free church—"denomination" perhaps. Probably, the denominational pattern of relating Christianity to the nation through competing but mutually recognitory free churches has received fullest expression in the United States. Yet the creative and formative elements of the conception must be sought in British history—in the passage from Puritanism to Nonconformity. Even as far as the actual adoption of denominationalism is concerned, the English achievement was of real significance. By the 1660's not only were the Puritan bodies completing their conversion to the free church principle, but even the Anglican Establishment, though certainly not a denomination in law, was painfully adjusting to its new role as an abstraction from the nation. And 1689 was to mark the beginnings of a legislative tradition by which the obligations of the magistrate were to be progressively reduced to the point where a modern bishop could say that the Church of England was in danger of remaining established only in lunatic asylums.<sup>1</sup>

In order to trace the shift in thought involved in these changes

it will be necessary first to analyze the disruptive qualities which Puritanism harbored and their embodiment in the Puritan sect. Then it will be possible to go on to an account of the adjustments forced upon both Puritan conservatives and radicals by the upheaval of the Puritan Revolution, and to conclude with a brief treatment of the Restoration and the free church principle.

## I

At the beginning of the seventeenth century the medieval ideal of one church enjoining uniformity upon the nation through a close partnership with a confessing state still went largely unchallenged in England. The Reformation had introduced changes, but the state had seized supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs and it chose to maintain uniformity for political purposes. Learned men held various views as to the limits of the prince's ecclesiastical power, but few questioned the principle that princely duties did exist or the idea, given classic expression by Hooker, that the church was the nation in its religious aspect. These assumptions, moreover, conformed with the actual situation. Neither the isolated Roman Catholic recusants nor the tolerated French and Dutch congregations nor the nascent separatist conventicles raised any serious threat to the unity of the Establishment.

To this generalization Puritanism constituted no exception. It is true that Puritan theologians developed the two-kingdom theory of church and state as two distinct and autonomous administrations, separate in offices, in methods, and, to some degree, in ends. But if they were distinct, they were not functionally unrelated. Like the twins of Hippocrates, church and state prospered and declined together. Thus, the magistrate, though holding his power directly from God and supreme in the civil sphere, was to hearken to the Word, punish with death offenses against the First Table, and defend the true and suppress false religions. In this system there was little room for dissent and none for schism. "Those which would withdraw themselves," taught Cartwright, "should be by ecclesiastical discipline at all times, and now also under a godly prince by civil punishment, brought to communicate with their brethren." And though much was said about freedom of religion, this was conceived solely in terms of freedom for the church to assume the form prescribed in scripture, to which the magistrate must himself reverently submit and compel his subjects to do likewise.<sup>2</sup>

For over three quarters of a century prior to the meeting of the Long Parliament in 1640 the organization of an effective national church on some plan like this was the aim of Puritan leadership. True to Reformed precedent, Puritanism had at first attempted to accomplish this by converting the sovereign, but Elizabeth and her successors declined to play the role of the godly prince, and consequently the party

had sought the aid of the "lesser magistrates" in parliament. In 1640 men thought that at last the waiting was over. With the Elizabethan compromise discredited, the prelates disgraced, and the crown paralyzed, the Long Parliament seemed about to undertake a reformation. Even the undercurrent of concern over disagreement as to the pattern for the new Establishment was lost in the general hope that "if the Prelates were downe, all would agree in one."<sup>3</sup> But these expectations proved false. Doubtless several factors—parliamentary Erastianism, loyalties to episcopacy, popular anticlericalism—contributed to this final frustration of the Puritan hope, but none was more devastating than the emergence in strength at this time of certain characteristics, deeply disruptive of the idea of a national church, which had long constituted a recessive theme in the history of the movement. What were these characteristics?

There was, first of all, the uneasiness of Puritanism in operating with a concept of a church which was something less than a perfect Christian society. Evident throughout Puritanism and present in even the most orthodox men was a profound disquiet at the necessity of tolerating within the church elements which from outward evidence could not be numbered among the elect. Troeltsch traced this tendency to Puritanism's Calvinistic inheritance and sought to show that the idea of the holy community encountered difficulty when transferred from a city-state with a selective population to a great territorial state. While this is not to be disputed, it is wise to state this in terms native to the English Puritan mind.

This can be done by reference to the continuous interplay in Puritan history of two central themes in its piety—its concern for disciplining all life to God's revealed will and its concern for relating the Christian to God through immediate experience and in contempt of all mediatory principles. The one, conceived in Puritanism's notorious scripturism, expressed itself in an insatiable appetite for reformation, both individual and institutional. The other, the experiential note, sounded again and again in Puritan sermons, diaries, biographies, and guides to the spiritual life, attained its climax in the conversion experience, which was not an ornament but a norm of the religious life. Though not without elements of mutual support—reforming zeal could and did flow from a heart transformed by the divine encounter as well as from obedience to the divine purpose disclosed in scripture—these emphases were sometimes in tension. Such divergence appeared when these principles were applied to the church. The scriptural emphasis was consonant with the idea of a national church since obedience to God's will was not only the earnest desire of the saints but the duty of the unredeemed world as well, which was to be coerced to moral performance for the glory of God. Hence the Puritan attrac-

tion for an Establishment in which the disciplinary functions of the church would receive all emphasis. But it was otherwise with the stress on experience. There was little possibility of translating the Christian's solitary encounter into a social principle applicable to the unregenerate world. Thus, the concept of a national church could be maintained only at the expense of disturbing to some extent the central requisite of conversion. To this degree, Puritanism was a faith more suitable to a religious elite than to a nation. Within orthodox Puritanism, relief was sought by the formation of select groups, like the early prophesying, or later, Baxter's Thursday evenings with the "most desirous," or the apprentices' prayer meeting to which the young Lilburne attached himself.<sup>5</sup> Outside the pale, the sects represented another answer. Probably the problem did not become acute until 1640, since before that time the persecuted Puritan body within the church could serve as the holy community with which men could identify themselves. But when the time came for building the Puritan Establishment, some would be satisfied only by the radical sectarian solution.<sup>6</sup>

Another disruptive force, closely related to the above tendency, was the invitation, inherent in Puritan thought, to make ever more radical the distinction between the civil and religious realms. Such a distinction, grounded in the fundamental division of nature and grace in Puritan metaphysics, already existed in the movement's political thought, as we have seen with regard to the two-kingdom theory. Cartwright took pains to point out that historically the church had existed apart from the commonwealth, that by exile or excommunication a man could be a member of one and not the other, and that lands of mixed Christian and infidel population exhibited the distinction concretely. Even in Tudor England the distinction was evident, the state being oriented toward "commodityes of this lyfe," while the church, holy, unchanging, and enjoying the magistracy of Christ, raised its vision to the life eternal. Nor was this permitted to remain on the level of academic reasoning. Popular targets in the war against Anglicanism were the bishops' performance of civil duties and—though more dangerous—royal usurpation of the prerogatives of the church. Beyond these limits Puritan conservatives did not venture. But others did, extending the argument dangerously. This could be done in one of two ways. If the distinction between civil and religious realms was conceived in terms of the *superiority* of the latter, the sinfulness of honoring the state's obstruction of reformation could become a ruling conviction. In this case, freedom through any alternative was imperative. There was not a great distance from Cartwright's aphorism, "As the hangings are made fit for the house, so the commonwealth must be made to agree with the church," to Browne's concept of "reformation without tarry-

ing."<sup>7</sup> This path was not in itself truly revolutionary. Born of impatience and desperation, its aims remained essentially conservative, though the very act of separation had unexpected implications which made themselves felt in the subsequent life of the sect. But if, on the other hand, the distinction was understood in terms of *separateness* of the two realms, and extension made in this direction, revolutionary changes were possible.

Lastly, there was Puritanism's extraordinary fecundity in producing a wide variety of both external forms and modes of piety which could serve as the governing principle around which the church might be shaped. This too was to undermine the hope of a Puritan Establishment, but like the other disruptive characteristics, this factor was at first in the background and far from the intention of the original leaders. Truth was one and Puritans were doctrinaires. "Throw to the Moales and to the Bats every rag that hath not Gods stamp and name upon it." But by 1640, when this was spoken, the Puritan community was far from one mind as to what government qualified for "Gods stamp and name." For despite the blueprints formulated by Elizabethan Puritans, the initial failure of the movement to capture the church in 1558 had left the definition of New Testament polity open to eighty years of further discussion. The ambiguity of scripture and the limitless exegetical self-assurance whereby, as Hobbes complained, "every Boy and Wench that could read English, thought they spoke with God Almighty," insured that ecclesiological disunities should be latent in the movement.<sup>8</sup> Nor was this all. Puritan piety was itself a complex, containing various elements, not only the biblical, but also the experiential, as we have seen, with a subordinate rationalistic theme. Complexity did not necessarily mean instability, but in the atmosphere of continuous crisis in which Puritanism dwelt after the accession of Charles I there was an increasing tendency for the Puritan synthesis to disintegrate. This in turn meant the emancipation to pure expression of two elements—mysticism and rationalism—which not only added new diversity but which were often conducive to the liquidation of the visible church entirely. So long as survival in the struggle with the prelates absorbed Puritan effort, all these possibilities remained somewhat hidden. Even obvious polity differences were eclipsed by anti-Anglican polemic, as the Dissenting Brethren noted in 1643, and it is well to remember Baxter's often quoted comment that until 1641 he "never thought what Presbytery or Independency was, nor ever spake with a man who seemed to know it."<sup>9</sup> But the Revolution which brought Puritanism to power was also to precipitate its fragmentation and thereby to place beyond recall the Church of England as Hooker and Jewel, or for that matter as Cartwright and even Browne had conceived it.

Taken together, then, these intellectual strands tended toward a



sort of secondary ecclesiastical outlook of Puritanism. Though explicit after 1640, this outlook remained largely recessive until that date. But not wholly so. For the sect, modest though its place was in the larger religious history of the period, represents a pre-Revolutionary objectification of these emphases. And its study is especially important because it represents these in some purity, before the foliation of Puritanism had completely altered the religious environment in which the nation lived. As a consequence, it is now necessary to consider briefly the meaning of the Puritan sect.

## II.

Though not without some preparation earlier, sectarian history may properly be said to begin with the publication of Robert Browne's *Reformation without Tarrying for Anie* in 1582, a work which was in some sense descriptive of the author's act in already gathering a church at Norwich. Browne's sectarian sojourn was short—by 1586 he was back in the Establishment again—and outside London his example was followed only by few. Yet the theoretical foundations he had laid were of permanent significance. During the next three decades, in the work of Barrow, Greenwood, Penry, Johnson, Robinson, Smyth, Helwys, and others, the possibilities and limitations of separatism were quickly and thoroughly explored in both thought and experimentation. And in these explorations the disruptive tendencies, which conservative Puritanism was trying to keep in check, were to be realized.

The first and most obvious of these was the sect's repudiation of the ideal of the nation-church as a consequence of its drive toward the achievement of the holy community. A milestone in English religious history was passed when the church was defined as "a company of people called and separated from the world by the word of God, and joyned together by voluntarie profession of the faith of Christ, in the fellowship of the Gospell." Henceforth this was to be the chief argument of the sects in their war against the prelates and against more respectable Puritan brethren. All their tracts stressed this theme: "Great ignorance do the bishops and their ministers show, when they think that the whole nation of people is the Church of Christ."<sup>10</sup> Yet the fact of separation involved something more than simply the repudiation of the sinful Establishment. It involved also the creative formulation of substitute conceptions around which the new society could form. These were all based, it is true, on the claim that the sect was a congregation of saints, but there were some differences as to the means by which such a congregation was to be gathered. Normally, this service was performed by the covenant. Here the saints "gaue their consent, to ioine themselues to the Lord, in one couenant & felloweship together, & to keep & seek agrement vnder his lawes & gov-



ernment."<sup>11</sup> Thus, the covenant answered the need for some instrument which could bring into existence an artificial society to replace the larger natural community now rejected as a legitimate basis for ecclesiastical organization. That this was the salient purpose of the covenant was indicated by the fact that its form was political rather than credal. But within a short time adult baptism as an advance upon the covenant was being considered, and by 1609 the first Baptist conventicle had been organized at Amsterdam. It was inevitable that this issue should so early intrude into the life of the sects. For so long as infant baptism went unrepudiated, the exclusion of the unsanctified from the church was not made explicit and some logical connection was retained with the whole nexus of presuppositions undergirding a national church. Consequently, the gravitation of John Smyth and others to the practice of adult baptism was a logical termination of the quest for the true community of saints. In such churches as they established, the covenant, while not always abandoned, was necessarily devitalized and its place taken by baptism as the enabling factor in the formation of the church. But some, notably Smyth, did not stop even here. For by the end of his career of repeated experimentation, Smyth could subordinate "outward church and ceremonies" and begin to suggest, though somewhat tentatively, that the true church would be gathered, not by covenant or baptism, but by the operation of the Spirit in the hearts of men. Though as yet accepted by few, here was the final culmination of the Puritan attraction to experience as the basis of the church.<sup>12</sup>

In making these departures, the sect has been credited with introducing, or re-introducing, the voluntary element into the church. It is true that in the task of abstracting the holy community from the nation, the sect was driven to expedients which placed initiative in the individual Christian. Yet any regard for freedom in these creations was secondary. Indeed, pioneer sectarian leaders sometimes stated that it was the duty of princes to *command* their regenerate subjects to enter gathered churches.<sup>13</sup> The logic of this position may be somewhat difficult, but it makes clear that if the sect ultimately became voluntary, it was because there was nothing else for it to become. Later, mounting scepticism as to the prince's churchly authority impelled the sects to give full emphasis to the principle that the true church must be erected on a voluntary basis, but once again caution must be exercised. In this there was nothing of modern voluntarism, of leaving the individual free to associate with that expression of Christianity which best ministered to his personal requirements. This "voluntarism" was a high conception in which the free decision was God's and the Christian's freedom was limited to obeying the divine call and submitting to that sect which alone stood in the way of truth. In this type

of "voluntaryism" there was no inconsistency in condemning "Toleration of many Religions, whereby the kingdom of God is shouldered out-a-doors by the devil's kingdom."<sup>14</sup> Thus, if the Puritan sect, in its hungering after a visible holy fellowship, had broken the national church and created the machinery of voluntary affiliation, its ethos could remain conservative.

Much the same combination of innovation and conservatism was evident in the sects' treatment of the Puritan distinction between the civil and religious realms. On the one hand, sectarian history exhibits a progressive movement toward a final disjunction of the two societies. But it is also clear that many early separatists were primarily moved by a conviction of the holiness and superiority of the church, and only secondarily by a consideration of the separateness of the two institutions. Though proclaiming the liberty of the church from any bondage to earthly authority, they by no means excused the magistrate from his duties to true religion. "It is the Office and duty of Princes . . .," taught the Amsterdam church in 1596, "to establish and mayntein by their lawes every part of Gods word his pure Relligion" as well as to root out all "counterfeyt worship of God." And though Browne and others sometimes spoke trenchantly about the uselessness of persecution, they still expected Israel to coerce backsliding Reuben and Gad in the day of triumph.<sup>15</sup> Thus, despite rhapsodic treatment by older, particularly Congregational, historians, separation was born of reformation, not liberty. Yet the very act of separation carried with it a significance which those who took this course did not always appreciate. For, despite disclaimers of renouncing all relationship with the prince, the sect by its unilateral act of separating did in fact remove the magistrate from the church. Henceforth, in the life of the sect the magistrate would be wholly external (and in most cases, hostile). Any organic relationship with the state was relegated to theory. This in turn engendered a tension between theory and reality which encouraged a migration of emphasis to the limits and incompatibilities, i.e., to the separateness, of the two realms.

Eventually, sectarian writers were to embrace complete separation of church and state, but advance was gradual. It is not possible here to enter into the details of this movement of thought; the full story is contained in Jordan's massive study and, in less detail but perhaps with more focus, in Lyon's *Theory of Religious Liberty in England*.<sup>16</sup> All that may be said here is that the sectarian position progressed from the separation of the powers of the two domains to a partial separation of ends as well. This was implied in the Brownist and Barrowist position that magistrates are powerless to establish the true church, though they are obliged to suppress error. But the Baptists, as the most radical of the separatists, went still further to a

complete separation of ends, in which even the possibility of a Christian magistracy (though not of a Christian magistrate) was denied, and any attempt to set up such a monstrous authority was a sinful invasion of Christ's prerogative. "*For all earthly powers are one.*"<sup>17</sup> The position succinctly stated in this quotation was being announced by several sectarian thinkers by the end of the first decade of Stuart rule. It appears most dramatically, perhaps, in Smyth's last confession, in which he renounced his earlier intransigence and dogmatism.

The magistrate is not by vertue of his office to meddle with religion, or matters of conscience . . . but to leaue Christian religion free, to euery mans conscience, and to handle onely ciuill transgressions Rom. 13. iniuries and wronges of men against man, in murther, Adulterie, theft etc. for Christ onelie is the king, and lawgiuer of the church and conscience.

This same emphasis was also found in Helwys' *Mistery of Iniquity*, published in 1612, and two years later Leonard Busher's *Religions Peace* expounded the thesis that "the King and State may defend religion's peace by their sword and civil power, but not the faith, other than by the word and spirit of God."<sup>18</sup>

One must again exercise caution, however. Separation of church and state, even when generally adopted, was to be variously interpreted. For the concept raised fundamental difficulties for the sect. While it barred the magistrate from intrusion into the domain of religion, it presumably created a like barrier to the penetration of the church into the secular world. Here the separationist solution had to come to terms with Puritan activism and zeal for reformation. The Puritan sect, in renouncing the services of the state to the church, never surrendered the aim of subjecting the world to God's will. There was no world-resignation, no Continental Anabaptist mentality, in the Puritan sect. The issue seldom arose, but when it did, the path of retirement from the world was seen to hold little attraction. Characteristically, refusal to deny the lawfulness of oaths, force, and magistracy was a large factor in preventing the earliest Baptists from losing their identity in the Dutch Mennonites.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, the problem of the sect on this score was especially great because of its deep concern for a Puritan reconstruction of society. Its members were largely drawn from orders of society where dissatisfaction had produced a powerful tradition of social protest. Furthermore, for the sect the problem of strictly ecclesiastical reform had been solved, releasing its energies to the task of transforming the social and political world. (Of course, the church problem could not be finally settled until all Christians embraced the sectarian solution, but in a sense the sect was living in a "post-reformation" world.)

In order to do this the saints had to be heard in places of power, and this required some positive policy toward magistracy. To men

feeling this compulsion and yet committed to the separation of church and state, two possibilities were open. If, on the one hand, God's relationship with the world was one of judgment, if human society was understood primarily in terms of its enmity with God, then conquest, rule, and discipline of this society by the saints was essential. In this case separation of church and state was only an interim policy, suitable so long as political sovereignty represented the world but obsolete when it should be a delegacy from Christ. But if, on the other hand, the world was understood primarily as God's creation in which, through a different mode of operation, He brought His purposes to pass, then the duty of the sect was to work for reformation in that world by appealing to the common moral light possessed by even unregenerate men. Actually, neither of these possibilities was well developed by the sects in the pre-Revolutionary period. The theocratic solution was too remote for these tiny persecuted conventicles, though some relief was found in millenarianism. And the alternative solution implied a concept of natural law which was still very imperfect in the world of the sects, though explorations in this direction can be seen in the interest in the moral law of the Old Testament as applicable to Jews, Turks, and pagans. But if at this juncture the sect tended to rest content with a general assertion of the magistrate's obligations to righteousness and morality, the ingredients were present for more extensive development later. With the spectacular growth in numbers and power of the sect in the Revolution, these two options of separationist activism were to become not only explicit, but competitive. Whether the sect would have any lasting contribution to make to the English free church depended on which interpretation would triumph.

Lastly, it will be recalled, Puritanism's "recessive" ecclesiastical tradition made for extensive variety in both polity and piety, and this too became explicit in the Puritan sect. For the sect was the product of Puritan activism, and just as this activism translated concepts of the holy community and of the distinction of the two realms into historical reality, so also it drove the varieties of Puritan piety and polity into objective expression in a swarm of petty conventicles. But the sect's services did not end here. The whole sectarian world constituted a culture in which new divisions could readily take place. Several factors explain this. First of all, by the very act of separating, sectaries crossed the psychic barrier of schism and entered the domain of experimentation. For them the critical decision was passed, and no very powerful inhibitions could operate against attraction to future divisions. Thus, by the very conditions of their formation, the sects had enveloped themselves in an atmosphere of experimentation which all their dogmatism and discipline were powerless to combat. This tendency was furthered by the absence of any magisterial restraint, for

authority did not exist in this milieu except as an external force, dangerous to all. Thus paradoxically, a freedom prevailed here which the state was incapable of touching. Lastly, there was the architecture of the sect itself. It was small, easily formed, autonomous. Its limits were the congregation, or at best some vague and sporadically maintained connexional relations. Its control and occasionally its leadership were laic and popular. All these factors made it both simple and unstable. It was easy to create, and easy to dissolve. And in this capacity to divide and subdivide, the sect was equal to the task of bringing all the latent disunity of Puritanism to expression.

But once again misinterpretation must be avoided. Hospitality to variation did not mean real tolerance or mutual recognition. The fluidity and experimentation which characterized the sects' world was their cross, not their glory. Unwillingness to permit the state to intrude into Christ's kingdom inhibited their persecution of rivals, but they were quite ready to use those spiritual weapons which were legitimate. Consequently, their substantial unity of outlook was buried beneath the weight of really monumental controversy and vituperation. In time changes would come, but not yet was there any marked emphasis on those common sectarian aims and values which the union of mind and arm in the "good old cause" would ultimately bring to the fore.

By 1640, then, the sect had completed its evolution and confronted the more traditional churchly Puritanism of the Right with a mature alternative. Intent on bringing down the bishops and encouraged by early successes, Puritan leaders discounted this threat from the left. Probably in numbers, learning, and social condition it *was* contemptible. Yet these reassurances were irrelevant to its real threat, that it had brought to expression the whole secondary ecclesiastical tradition of Puritanism and thus mirrored disruptive tendencies carried within the Puritan Right itself. And this was not all. The challenge of the sect was thrown down at the moment when freedom and the necessity of ecclesiastical decision were propelling Puritanism toward its inevitable crisis and disintegration. In 1640 when the Scots urged a thorough reformation in England in order that "the names of Sects and Separatists shall no more be mentioned," Laud had written in his copy of the tract, "Because all will be such."<sup>20</sup> This prophecy, pregnant with unsuspected accuracy, was soon to present conservative Puritanism with a tremendous problem, undermining its teachings on the world and society. But it was to be a challenge to the sects as well. In 1640 they were entering into a novel religious environment, and despite their services to its making, their problems of adjustment were to be equally fundamental. It remained to be seen what revolu-



tions would be elicited in both church and sect by the great Revolution in society.

### III.

After the meeting of the Long Parliament in November, 1640, the religious transformations were so swift that conservative Puritanism had little warning or preparation. Instantly the position of each religious body was changed, even before any conscious adjustments or reactions could take place. In time traditional Puritan theory was to alter too, as slowly and painfully attempts were made to confront the situation realistically. This was most evident in Independency. And finally, in the Cromwellian Establishment, conservative Puritanism reached the limits of that adjustment of which it was capable without abandoning its conception of an established church entirely. These stages must be considered in turn.

The primary feature of the English religious scene in the 1640's was the appearance and quick ascendancy of ecclesiastical multiplicity. For the first time in modern history a great Western nation faced problems arising from a population, confessionally Christian, but so divided in detail as to shatter all outward unity and to necessitate ecclesiastical systems of diverse character. What factors contributed to transforming England into this "great Amsterdam"? First, Anglicanism would not co-operate in its liquidation. Misled by the Laudians' unpopularity, Puritan reformers had expected that opposition would be confined to "scandalous ministers" and eccentric diehards. Instead, a vigorous though somewhat subterranean Anglicanism functioned until the Restoration. Equally unexpected was the partitioning of the Puritan Right into several hostile and jealous parties as soon as models for the new Establishment began to be put before parliament and public. Some, advocates of godly reformed episcopacy, were numerous but politically unorganized and eventually added to the support of the old church. Others, favoring free congregations of Christians yet believing in an Establishment, organized as orthodox Congregationalists on the New England pattern. Still others, influenced by Elizabethan traditions and Continental example and attracted by the advantage of Scottish support, adhered to Presbyterianism.<sup>21</sup> Efforts to heal these schisms were unavailing, and divisions born here were, in fact, to be permanent. But there was still a third factor in the development of this pluralistic scene, for 1640 was also to inaugurate the spectacular expansion of sectarian Puritanism. This must be ascribed to many things: to the strength of the holiness ideal militating against any Establishment; to the disappearance of effective censorship and other controls; to the great variety of sectarian offerings in both theology and polity; and especially to the powerful spirit of experimentation raised in the nation by the Revolution. "Most of the people who are



counted religious," mourned the Presbyterian Baillie, "are running to wayes of errorr and schisme of many diverse kinds."<sup>22</sup> And this abundance of religious communions, simply by existing, had already undermined traditional Puritan teachings concerning church and state in several vital respects.

For regardless of its pretensions, each religious group now had to function on the hypothesis, entirely foreign to its tradition, that it was a private association of Christians not uniquely related to the welfare of the state. None was able to command the support of the government for its doctrines, even Presbyterianism enjoying such assistance on only a regional and temporary basis. Rather, all were obliged to organize on their own initiative, and in so doing they surrendered in practice their reliance on national authority as the only legitimate instrument of reformation. Congregationalists early developed their self-governing churches without the aid of the magistrate. Presbyterians hoped long for national control, but ultimately they too set up classes on a local or regional basis. In some cases ministers of various shades of thought adopted the machinery of voluntary association to secure some measure of local unity. Such was Baxter's group in Worcestershire. Anglican leaders counselled their laity to refuse "to hear the voice of strangers" and to unite as a "flock under those whom we acknowledge our lawful Pastors."<sup>23</sup>

A still further consequence of this situation was that each party had to compete or risk being left behind in the race for public support. Distasteful though it was, conservative Puritans of every stripe now entered the marketplace and displayed their wares in a frenzy of preaching and publishing. This necessity was not only abhorrent to the political outlook of each of these groups, but competition itself carried dangerous implications. For one thing, it meant acknowledging a *de facto* equality among the disputants. Here all outward and obvious distinctions, even between churchly Puritanism and its sectarian offspring, fell away. Each was denied the instruments of compulsion. Each was forced to live by its own resources. Even high churchmen descended into the arena to do battle with the sects, as Wood's account of Peter Gunning revealed:

On the week days, he would look out all sorts of sectaries and dispute with them openly in their own congregations. Nor was there any considerable sect, whether Presbyterian, Independent, Anabaptist, Quaker, Brownist, Socinian, etc., but that he held with them some time or other a public disputation in defence of the Church of England.<sup>24</sup>

Competition also implied something more. It implied recognition of the individual's freedom to choose. For in entering a contest from which compulsion was barred, conservative Puritanism accepted in

practice the finality of each Christian's judgment. And in so doing it took to itself a principle which cut the ground from under its own teachings about uniformity. Thus it embraced voluntarism, but in a form different from that of the sects. For sectarian voluntarism, though based on principle, was originally a pure act of renunciation of the idea of a national church. This voluntarism arose from painful necessity but resulted in the individual being invited to exercise his volition over a wide field of alternatives.

These developments issued spontaneously from the historical situation without dependence on deliberate reactions of the Puritan churches. But transformations of this scope inevitably affected the thought of the Right too. Doubtless at first the tendency was for all to voice claims of *jus divinum* as stridently as possible and to work frantically for the political advantage which alone could give force to these claims. But would a deeper understanding of the ecclesiastical situation force modifications of the churchly tradition of conservative Puritanism? Answers were various. Many admitted no modification. But Presbyterianism harbored some capacity for adjustment. And in Independency truly revolutionary developments were to take place.

Probably domination and repression remained the most prominent notes in the thought of the contending parties. This was certainly the case with Anglicans, though in adhering to the Elizabethan settlement, they deserted the principle of comprehension on which it had been built, condemned the church to a fractional role in English religion, and thus made their contribution to "denominationalizing" the nation. But the Presbyterians, because of the seriousness of their bid for dominance, were chiefly identified with this position. Even before the Westminster Assembly the Presbyterians had acquired a reputation as the leading advocates of repression. The charge was soon to be heard from many sources—Independents, sects, army, Levellers, Erastians, and others. Digby's fear of a "Pope in every parish," Overton's onslaught on "Mr. Persecution," Milton's gibe that "new presbyter is but old priest writ large"—these are simply the most familiar expressions of an arraignment that was very general.<sup>25</sup> The grounds of this reputation were substantial. The Westminster Assembly was not, could not be, forbearing toward dissent. Presbyterian controversialists, prodded by the busy Baillie, were not remarkable for breadth of mind or generous spirit. Something of the party's mentality was revealed in Edwards' curious announcement in 1641 that he labored "for the healing of this schisme" by writing a treatise against toleration.<sup>26</sup> But this was not the whole story. For while many Presbyterians adhered to the program of seeking domination and repression, a more realistic solution commanded support among some of the party's influential leaders. This was the idea of accommodation, of finding some archi-

tectural formula by which the scruples of dissenting opinion could be satisfied. This was a major theme in Presbyterian history, perhaps even the dominant one after the early failures of the 1640's. In the tortured history of the revolutionary era, it became the central feature in every Presbyterian manoeuvre to win advantage, as suitable for approaches to Anglicans as to Independents.

This may be considered a slight and inadequate relaxation of Presbyterian rigor. Repression was still the goal. Magistrates were still to put themselves at the disposal of the church, now grown more powerful because of its partially restored unity. But logically, any compromise would be destructive of a Presbyterianism that was *de jure divino*, and the question must be asked, on what basis was accommodation possible at all? Much of the answer is to be found in the nature of the Presbyterian party. Unlike Scottish Presbyterianism, English Presbyterianism possessed considerable flexibility—though this is sometimes overlooked because of the notoriety of its intransigent element. This flexibility resulted partly from the party's being as greatly shaped by the political considerations which dominated the critical years 1640 to 1642 as by theological conviction. Thus some Presbyterians were later able to modify their concepts of polity when these were demonstrated to be out of step with the attainment of a strong Presbyterian Establishment. Typical of this development was the party chieftain, Stephen Marshall, who by 1647 was stating that Christ had ordained no polity and that the essential thing was a church consonant with the Word and preservative of Christian unity.<sup>27</sup> Flexibility also stemmed from Presbyterianism's tendency to receive all those to whom polity considerations were secondary. For the secessions from the party in the early 1640's had left the Presbyterian leadership in possession of a great mass of residual Puritanism, often ecumenical and in any case not deeply committed as to church government. Of these Baxter was the spiritual head, though others like Calamy and Manton were also significant.<sup>28</sup>

As a consequence of these elements, accommodation occupied an important place beside domination in Presbyterian history. But it could not occupy a very important place in the liberalization of conservative Puritan thought. The concessions policy was never pushed through to a conclusion, nor was the party able entirely to purge itself of the taint of insincerity. More importantly, that policy itself did not represent any inner revolution, but simply a more politic arrangement of resources the party had long possessed. And lastly, accommodation was itself a clumsy, unrealistic, and unworkable instrument to recover the lost ecclesiastical unity of England, and its effectiveness ultimately depended on whatever repressive techniques the church could command.

Indeed, the most important departure of the Puritan Right in

coming to terms with the ecclesiastical revolution lay elsewhere. The Independents also desired a state church, the maintenance of true religion by the magistrate, and the disciplining, to a greater or less degree, of outrageous sectarian radicalism. But despite frequent negotiations, their interest in accommodation was largely nominal. Instead, they developed a different and competing theory, by which they both justified an Establishment and genuinely confronted the problems raised by a pluralistic religious scene. This theory abandoned the orientation toward structural reunion and sought to associate various Christian bodies in a loosely constructed Establishment to which the magistrate would give his indiscriminative support. Here was neither a domination nor accommodation, but co-existence.

It seems likely that the genesis of this theory owes little to Independent tendencies toward real liberalism or tolerance. It was first put forward, not by the party's later radical wing, but by its clerical leaders during the early 1640's. These men occupied a difficult and ambivalent position. On the one hand, they were incapable of yielding to the Presbyterian arguments, partly because it was necessary to save the church from profanation by admission of the unregenerate, and partly because they were preoccupied with regaining that practical freedom in pulpit and lectureship which orthodox Puritanism had known to a great degree under Elizabeth and James. But on the other hand, the idea of a general toleration was thoroughly repugnant to them, as the *Apologeticall Narration* made plain.<sup>29</sup> Consequently, interest began to focus on co-existence within a larger spiritual unity. This idea, quite possibly suggested by the Congregational polity of a fraternity of independent churches, was already present in the arguments of the Dissenting Brethren at the Westminster Assembly. But though co-existence was originally not meant to go beyond the two "denominations" represented in the Assembly, the idea hid a genuinely radical departure. First, it implied a rejection of uniformity as a fundamental ecclesiastical goal, and an acceptance of "schism" as a permanent and normal feature of the church. Hereafter, Independents might plead for repression of heresy but they could not logically condemn the proliferation of the sects on grounds of the outrage done to church unity. Secondly, it meant that the *differentiae* of the two polities lodged in an area not essential to the faith, and that here (without admitting doubts as to the truth of one's own position) it was possible amicably to disagree. And this, in turn, necessitated discussion of the demarcation between Christian essentials and those inessentials where variation was tolerable. Taken together, these principles provided a framework within which the widening of the limits of co-existence could take place.

But this was still in the realm of the possible, not the necessary.

Indeed, the most obvious feature of the Independent position was its elasticity, both conservative and experimental minds finding places among its exponents. What finally drove Independency to a broad construction was the addition of other factors, political and theological. Politically, Independent leaders soon awoke to the necessity of sectarian support if they were to battle successfully against the Presbyterian drive for domination. Therefore, they were increasingly tempted to judge sectarian opinion as tolerable variation and hence worthy of a place in that common Christianity which the state was to uphold. The theological development was more interesting and requires a return to that basic Puritan balance of law and experience. In Independency, as in the sects, tension between these polarities became acute. On the one hand, preoccupation with polity resulted in great stress being laid on the correctness of externals, but on the other, conversion as a prerequisite to church membership emphasized the work of the Holy Spirit in the formation of a true Christian fellowship. In radical Independency this experimental quality frequently rose to dominance, and in doing so it cleared the way both for an openness to further spiritual discoveries and for a new view of the church as a visible unity transcending institutional barriers.<sup>30</sup> This note had appeared early among separating Congregationalists. "The Lord had more truth and light yet to break forth out of his holy Word," was Robinson's parting thought to the American Pilgrims, while the Southwark covenant of 1616 pledged its signatories to "walk together in all God's ways and ordinances, according as He had revealed, or should further make known to them." Among the non-separating Congregationalists it appeared in the promise of the *Apologeticall Narration* "not to make our present judgment and practice a binding law unto themselves for the future."<sup>31</sup> With the gravitation of Independency toward its allies on the left, this outlook was more emphatically and frequently expressed. Party manifestoes by Cook, sermons by Owen, speeches by Cromwell all made the point, but it was left to a certain John Jones to provide the most eloquent testimony:

let noe man despise his brother that hath not attained to his light, or withdraw his communion with him, because he submitts not his judgm<sup>t</sup> to him . . . the greatest Tirany that can be exercised upon any member of X<sup>t</sup> is to debar him from those Priviledges and enjoym<sup>ts</sup> upon the acc<sup>t</sup> of being different in judgm<sup>t</sup> or upon any account for which our heavenly father will not keepe him out of heaven.<sup>32</sup>

And by the time these words were spoken this spirit had travelled far beyond the bounds of Independency to affect the whole Puritan Left and to provide the integrating principle for the "good old cause."

These, then, were the foundations on which the Independent theory of church-state relations was laid. That theory itself received



full utterance throughout the 1640's and 1650's. Perhaps it was most pithily stated by Jeremiah Burroughes, one of the Dissenting Brethren, in 1646:

As this is a dividing principle, That all things should be tolerated, so the other is as truly dividing and false, That nothing should be tolerated. . . . The Magistrate cannot command every good thing nor punish every evil. The abstruse controversies in religion, come not under the cognisance of the magistrate as a magistrate; only such things as are against the rules of common justice and equity, and the common light of Christianity where he is to govern Christians.<sup>33</sup>

Here all its main elements were expressed: the rejection of the sectarian solution of separation, the abhorrence of unlimited toleration, the retention of Christian magistracy, not at the disposal of a particular way, but rather informed by "the common light of Christianity." This was the theory which Ireton and Nye defended in the Whitehall debates of 1648 against Leveller and sectarian champions of separation. This was the theory which Owen declared before the commons in 1652 when he coupled an insistence that magistrates should "act clearly for the good, welfare, and prosperity of the church" with the all-important qualification:

Not that I would you should go and set up forms of government, to compel men to come under the line of them, or to thrust in your sword to cut the lesser differences of brethren . . . but only this, that . . . it is incumbent on you, to take care that the faith . . . in all necessary concerns of it, may be protected, preserved, propagated to and among the people which God hath set you over.

This was the theory which finally reached authoritative exposition in the twenty-fourth chapter of the Congregationalists' Savoy Confession of 1658.<sup>34</sup> Throughout this discussion, the limits placed on the projected Establishment were various, but the wide expanse of which it was capable was revealed in tracts like *The Ancient Bounds* which deserve an honored place in the literature of liberty of conscience:

The magistrate is to conserve and maintain the churches' peace and liberty in the exercise of their consciences and worshipping of God. . . . And this respect he is to bear to all equally, whom he judges to be the children of truth in the main, though scabby or itchy children through some odd differences. In which things though he be not to further them or edify them, wherein he apprehends them alien from the truth, by any compliance, but to leave those opinions to themselves to stand or fall; yet (notwithstanding them) he is to afford to them his civil protection.<sup>35</sup>

In passages like these we witness right-wing Puritan thought at last probing the limits of that adjustment to which it had been driven by the events of 1640—limits which could not be transcended without deserting the essentials of its tradition altogether.



But there was one further development which requires brief exposition. The Independent theory came to life in Cromwell's Establishment. Here was a state professing its religious purpose: an official, comprehensive Protestantism, versatile in polity and piety yet not without some sense of basic unity; a prince, ecclesiastically benevolent but not intrusive, seeking instruction for public acts from the common light of Christianity. Without entering into the details of the church history of the Protectorate, what shape did the Independent theory assume in its actual operation?

It was not strange that an Establishment embodying co-existence should emerge as the final ecclesiastical settlement of the Protectorate. In a sense this paralleled the political pattern where, similarly, the attempt was made to infuse new spirit into traditional forms while eschewing genuinely radical reconstruction. It had sound practical justification. Like Elizabeth's settlement a century earlier, it provided for a comprehensive church based on a realistic appraisal of the English religious situation. In a more specific context, it had the advantage of occupying a mediating position, politically necessary to the Protectorate, between army demands for complete separation and the more conservative bias of the lawyers at Westminster and Whitehall. Yet it cannot be doubted that its precise shape was fixed by Cromwell and that Cromwell acted out of principle and conviction. For despite occasional sympathy toward other patterns of church-state relations, both separationist and theocratic, Oliver's support for a broad Protestant Establishment was never seriously shaken. To be sure, political reasonings may have been involved here—he is reported to have said that a state church was necessary to political control.<sup>36</sup> But more fundamentally, he could never abandon the idea of an Establishment as an instrument of Christian civilization, just as he could never see his magistracy in any light but that of service to God's people at both national and international levels. But if he believed in an Establishment, he also believed most passionately in the principle of co-existence. Throughout his career he preached that Christian liberty was "a thing that ought to be very reciprocal," and he seldom missed an opportunity to upbraid subjects for want of brotherly love.<sup>37</sup>

All this appeared clearly in the acts of the Protectorate. The religious character of the state was broadly evident, in moral legislation, citizenship policies, and the conduct of foreign affairs, as well as in ecclesiastical matters. The declaration in Article XXXV of the Instrument of Government, "that the Christian Religion contained in the Scriptures be held forth and recommended as the public profession of these nations," was merely the constitutional reflection of this basic conviction.<sup>38</sup> But the extreme simplicity of this Article was also significant, for its large silences suggested the inhibitions of the state.

The government, in fact, held itself aloof from specific ecclesiastical prescription. The Cromwellian church, as Stoughton has remarked, "had no Church courts, no Church assemblies, no Church laws, no Church ordinances."<sup>39</sup> The maintenance of religion and the "approbation of public preachers" it regarded as legitimate functions, but beyond these limits, into the complex interior life of the churches where common Christian faith and ethics could provide no certain guidance, it did not venture to go. Thus the faith and practice of the denominations which comprised the Establishment were left entirely free.

Yet Cromwell did not wholly abandon the inheritance from the past. His fundamental social and political conservatism as well as his concern that the gospel be preached throughout the kingdom led him to retain the parish system with livings, patronage, and tithes. As machinery for the governance of this system he employed various commissions, national and regional, of which the best known was the Committee of Triers, created in 1654 to pass on the fitness of nominees to livings. This body was made up of thirty-three divines and ten laymen, Congregationalists and Presbyterians primarily, but also including several prominent Baptists who defied the separationist inclinations of their denomination in order to participate. Under these auspices, men of all three denominations, and episcopal churchmen in addition, were admitted as ministers of parish churches where they remained free from authoritative restrictions of any kind until uprooted at the Restoration.<sup>40</sup>

What were the limits of co-existence in a church of England so constituted? The Protector's broad tolerance made them wide, but there can be no doubt that such limits actually existed. A foundation of Christian essentials was always presupposed, but on the various occasions during the 1650's when efforts were made to draw up a statement of fundamentals Cromwell's fear of providing any entrée to bigotry prevented success. In the end the only formal requirement was "faith in God by Jesus Christ." "Whoever hath this faith," he told parliament, "let his form be what it will; he walking peaceably, without the prejudicing of others under another form."<sup>41</sup> Consequently the discretionary power of the Triers was great, though it seems to have been used honestly enough in the interests of a broad Reformed Protestantism. Yet even Cromwell's latitude had its limits. "Liberty of conscience . . .," he declared on one occasion, "should never, while he had any interest in the government, be stretched so far as to countenance them who denied the divinity of our Saviour, or to bolster up any blasphemous opinions contrary to the fundamental verities of religion."<sup>42</sup> Probably, in actual practice, the limits of the Cromwellian church were set, not so much by the government, but by the sectaries'

refusal, prompted by separationist scruples, to join it, thus necessitating an area of toleration between the Establishment and proscribed opinion.

Though its appeal was limited, the Cromwellian Establishment commanded wide respect. Its continuity with the past, its honesty and dedication in performance, its large measure of freedom, and above all, its concern for a religiously integrated civilization were attractive to many. Praise came even from sectaries, like Richardson, who were theoretically opposed, while from the other side, Baxter added his reluctant conclusion that the Triers "did abundance of good to the Church."<sup>43</sup> But it should not be supposed that the church encountered no difficulty or opposition. The retention of the parish system side by side with the denominations was a source of constant trouble. Henry Jessey filled his post at St. George's Southwark in the morning and spent the afternoon ministering to his Baptist conventicle, but not all could make so happy a disposition of the problem. Congregationalists in particular received an education in the practical contradictions inherent in their position—contradictions which came to a head on the question of administering the sacrament to unconverted parish congregations.<sup>44</sup> But the more radical competing theory offered the greatest difficulty. Ideas of complete separation of church and state dominated the sects and were making conquests even among respectable Puritans like John Goodwin and other Congregationalists. At times such ideas seem to have induced misgivings in Cromwell himself. When, in the course of his remarkable interview with Oliver, John Rogers attacked the Triers—"Who made them judges over Grace, my Lord? . . . How dare they take upon them to be judges over Grace? It is not you, but the Lord Jesus, that can make them such judges"—the Protector turned away without reply.<sup>45</sup>

Yet this was not his usual reaction. "There hath not been such a service to England since the Christian religion was professed in England," he declared in 1657.

Here are three sorts of godly men that you are to take care for, and that you have provided for in your settlement. And how could you now put it to the Presbyterian, but you must have done it with a possibility of the exclusion of all those of Anabaptism and of the Independents. And now we have put it into the way, that if a man be of any of these judgments, if he have the root of the matter in him, he may be admitted. This hath been our care and work.

Here again, in practice as in theory, conservative Puritanism explored its limits. Speaking in the authentic spirit of the Puritan Right, however modified by Independency, Cromwell had dwelt on the obligations of the state to Christian faith and people. "We know not how better to answer our duty to God and the nation, and the people of God, in that respect, than in doing what we did."<sup>46</sup> Through painful effort, this tradition had achieved the separation of the magistrate

from all particular expressions and interpretations of Christianity, but to proceed to his separation from the body of Christian people was beyond its power.

#### IV.

Like conservative Puritanism, left-wing Puritanism also felt the shock of the disintegration of religious unity, though its character and principles carried it through the crisis with less convulsive effect. Nonetheless, here too altered circumstances caused changes in the meaning of the sectarian witness as certain possibilities, subordinate before 1640, became ascendant. In particular, the principle of church-state separation swiftly won almost universal commitment, but such commitment was not without varying significance. For just as the Puritan Right developed diverse concepts of Establishment, the sects developed diverse and even opposing concepts of separation.

The sects entered the revolutionary epoch with specific ideological baggage, the ultimate meaning of which was not yet clear. Their basis lay in a free voluntary organization, but originally this had not been valued for its own sake. Rather, it resulted from the drive toward the holy community and from the collateral repudiation of the principle of the national church. Initially, neither the individual's liberty to choose his ecclesiastical affiliation nor toleration of differing churches and sects had any real place in this conception. Once again, the sect, in its capacity for experimentation and division, set forth the manifold facets of Puritan thought and piety. Yet in the midst of this diversity, the exclusive claims of each sect were hardly tempered at all. And lastly, though adherence to separation of church and state was growing in the sectarian world, such loyalty was strained by its seeming obstruction of the Puritan drive for social and political reformation.

All these features of the sect were to be greatly affected by the new religious environment described above. The first major shift, perhaps, was the migration of emphasis from the visible holy fellowship to the modern voluntaristic trait of the individual's freedom to choose. With the fall of the Anglican Establishment and the pathetic condition of its nominal successor, the "lame Erastian presbytery" (soon to be further maimed by its duel with the sects), the real religious situation throughout the 1640's was free denominationalism. The revival of the Establishment principle in the Cromwellian church in the 1650's was an unobtrusive superimposition on this reality rather than a serious challenge to it. Hence 1640 inaugurated an age of embarrassment for the sects when there was no substantial national church to repudiate. Witnessing for the holy community could still take place in this situation, as in the agitation against tithes, but deprived of its foil, it

was necessarily less dramatic and less emphatic. Furthermore, the relevant problem which faced individuals in this milieu was not national church versus holy community, but *which* holy community. Of course, variety and competition had existed in the sectarian underworld before the Revolution, but it was not until the advent of freedom that this became the prime characteristic of its environment. Thus everything conspired to emphasize the factor of choice. And choice was exercised. The religious culture of the Interregnum was saturated with personal experimentation as scores of spiritual pilgrims made their way from form to form seeking an elusive satisfaction. To this situation it required only the addition of the principle of mutual recognition among the sects for voluntarism to be exhibited in the form which it has assumed among the modern free churches.

And this was not long to come. For once again there was alteration of attitude. The sect had hitherto made objective the wonderful variety of Puritanism without, however, becoming reconciled to the religious diversity which it introduced. But in the decade of the 1640's the foundations of this exclusiveness were seriously undermined. Here the responsible factors were much the same as those which carried Independency to the same result. Politically, the outlook of Interregnum sectarianism was shaped by the exhaustive struggle for survival which it waged against the Presbyterian menace. In this effort, the sects inevitably discovered their basic unities of purpose and values. Thus what might have been merely a coalition gave way to a deeper comradeship. Unity was also reinforced by close military association; the New Model Army offered scant place to any consistent sectarian exclusiveness. Lastly, the theological factor was present. As in Independency, the experiential direction of Puritan piety often became ascendant, making possible an appreciation of the Holy Spirit working in every redeemed person, regardless of the variant ways in which human inadequacy articulated the experience. This attitude, respectful of difference yet neither sceptical nor indifferent and possible only where a Spiritist emphasis replaced the dogmatic theory of truth, was soon widespread throughout the Puritan left wing. "We know but in part, and do therefore wait upon God for further light," declared a Baptist confession of 1646, "yet we believe that we ought in our practice to obey . . . God in the use of that light which he hath given us."<sup>47</sup> To be sure, doctrinaire aspects of sectarianism always remained vigorous, as any random examination of titles in the *Short-Title Catalogue* will show. Even Bunyan, whose concern for "bearing with our brother" prevented his closing his Bedford church to pedobaptists, showed no deep sense of unity with Quakers who were raiding his flock. It is always well to remember Cromwell's repeated warning, "The several sorts of forms would cut the throats of one another, should not I keep



the peace." Yet the army of sectaries which Cromwell led could also declare:

Is all Religion wrapt up in . . . any one Form? Doth that name or thing, give the difference between those that are the Members of Christ and those that are not? We think not so. We say Faith working by love is the true Character of a Christian; and God is our witness, in whomsoever we see any thing of Christ to be, these we reckon our duty to love, waiting for a more plentiful effusion of the Spirit of God to make all those Christians, who by the malice of the world are diversified . . . to be of one heart and minde.<sup>48</sup>

With this principle of mutual recognition introduced into the situation, the partitive qualities of sectarian Puritanism were weakened, and an important contribution was made to the development of the unity of the free church tradition.

Lastly, there was the thorny and momentous problem of church-state separation, and to this it is necessary to devote the remainder of this section. The Puritan Left completed its commitment to this principle very swiftly after the launching of the Revolution in 1640. All traces of that stress on the duties of the magistrate which appeared in the pages of Elizabethan sectaries was gone. In practice, sects were occasionally tempted to use the power of the state for their own advantage, the most spectacular example being the Irish Baptists, but this was a minor theme in sectarian history.<sup>49</sup> The allurements of the Independent theory and its realization in the Cromwellian church were a more serious story. Some Baptists functioned in this Establishment.<sup>50</sup> John Tombes, the most celebrated Baptist theologian, was fully in accord, and a London Baptist declaration of 1659 substantially endorsed its theoretical basis.<sup>51</sup> But this again was a subordinate theme. Not only were the numbers small—fewer than thirty parish livings were held by Baptists at the Restoration—but denunciations of such compromise were common. "If any have received such commission . . . let them return it and quickly agree with the adversary," wrote John Rogers, and more authoritatively, the Western Association in 1656 coupled its prohibition with the warning, "It stops the mouth of a Minister from bearing an open and full testimony against the practise of the Parish Ministry, who Balaam-like, run after the reward."<sup>52</sup>

It was separation, then, that dominated the sects. This was demonstrated in a multitude of sermons, tracts, and petitions to authority, all using rather stereotyped arguments and favorite texts, such as the Parable of the Tares. The troopers in the army certainly left Baxter in no doubt as to their position on this score:

But their most frequent and vehement Disputes were for Liberty of Conscience, as they called it; that is, that the Civil Magistrate had nothing to do to determine of anything in Matters of Religion, by constraint or re-



straint, but every Man might not only hold, but preach and do in matters of Religion what he pleased: That the Civil Magistrate hath nothing to do but with Civil things, to keep the Peace, and to protect the Churches Liberties.<sup>53</sup>

Doubtless this triumph of the principle of separation had been speeded by events. The sects had needed an armory of arguments in the struggle against Presbyterian tyranny, and this the principle had supplied. It also offered a plausible and realistic solution to the problems of a pluralistic scene no less than did the Independent theory. Perhaps its most telling appeal lay in its absolute guarantee to religious liberty—hence the popularity of the demand of Levellers and others for a constitutional fundamental law embodying this principle.

But while the situation encouraged the idea of separation of church and state, it also heightened the urge toward a theocratic reshaping of the world. This aim had been evident in a sectarianism that was still small and politically impotent. With the decline of their enemies, Anglican and Puritan, and the rise of the army, the sects approached so near the centers of power that the idea of using the state to implement God's revealed will was bound to impress. Joined to the ancient popular tradition of social protest, now newly articulate in a rapidly expanding literature, this theocratic tendency was in position to contend for dominance of the sectarian mind.<sup>54</sup> In the army it constituted the most serious obstacle to Leveller propaganda, while in such brazenly unconstitutional experiments as the Little Parliament and the rule of the major-generals, it won practical, though temporary, application.

The consequence of this tension was that separation of church and state assumed two forms in Interregnum sectarian thought. With some the discipline and reconstruction of society by the elect remained the fundamental concern. Separation was then a policy to be promoted zealously in the world as now ordered, but it was not to be regarded as more than temporarily binding. Another possibility existed. The problem could also be resolved by an appeal to natural law, in which case the religious dynamic for reform would be expended in strenuous labors in the field of natural ethics.

Conjunction of separation and theocracy was certainly the ascendant attitude in wide regions of the Puritan Left where millenarian excitement bore sway. The Fifth Monarchy Men were its most obvious representatives, but it affected Quakers and Baptists as well. Wide differences existed as to whether godly rule was to be achieved by human or divine action, in history or at the end of history. But always there was the same expectation that a New Age, however conceived, would speedily supplant all worldly sovereignty. Until that time it was necessary vigilantly to defend the church against the intrusion of a worldly magistracy. Indeed, none denounced Cromwell's Triers

with more spirit than Fifth Monarchy Men: "The Graven image of the worldly power, creating a worldly Clergie, for worldly ends."<sup>55</sup> But such denunciations were always linked with anticipation of the time when rulers would possess, not worldly sanctions, but divine authority to transform the world. "The present interest of the Saints," counselled a typical manifesto, was to "associate together into several church-societies . . . till being increased and multiplied, they may combine into general assemblies or church-parliaments . . . and then shall God give them their authority and rule over the nations and kingdoms of the world."<sup>56</sup> Thus, separationism of this type had a distinctly interim character. Yet it was from sectaries of this persuasion that much of the demand for church-state separation came. Petitions demanding separation *and* swift vengeance on God's enemies were common. The Little Parliament, whose godly members, nominated by the sects, made it to some degree a theocratic assembly, was driving toward the abolition of tithes and patronage when it was dissolved. The works of John Rogers couple impassioned defenses of separation with pleas for a ruling "Sanhedrin." Rogers' interview with Cromwell, in fact, reveals most starkly the mentality of exponents of this interpretation of separation. Here the millenarian delegation pleaded with Oliver for liberty only to be betrayed into a swift reversal:

"Let us have Liberty of Conscience. Will you not give us so much liberty as the Parliament gave?" (with that he turned about in anger.)

O[liver] P[rotector]. "I tell you there was never such Liberty of Conscience, no, never such liberty since the days of Antichrist as is now—for may not men preach and pray what they will? and have not men their liberty of all opinions?"

Ro[gers]. "It is true there is liberty enough, and too much too, for drunkards, swearers, and men of vile debauched principles and evil lives, Common-prayer men, and such like, we know, round the nation."<sup>57</sup>

Pregnant with menace, these words prefigure the greater reversal which would come when the theocratic dream should be realized.

But as A. S. P. Woodhouse has taught us, the natural law interpretation of separation of church and state was also present in the Puritan Left.<sup>58</sup> Gropings in this direction, using distinctions between the First and Second Tables and between moral and ceremonial law, had been evident in pre-1640 sectarian thought. What had been lacking was any full understanding and usage of a doctrine of natural law. In some quarters this now began to appear, clearly among Levelers, more tentatively among sectaries. Schooled by John Goodwin, John Lilburne, Roger Williams and others, a part of the Puritan Left embraced the idea that civil society constituted a domain which God had left to the natural light he had implanted in men. Moreover, these men were careful to fix the limits of this natural light. In the army debates on religion, Ireton and fellow conservatives argued for the magistrate's role in religion, not only from scripture, but also from

an ambitious construction of natural law which provided for duties to God as well as to neighbor. But their efforts only served to elicit replies like the remarkable speech of Wildman:

It is not easily determinable what is sin by the light of nature. If the gentleman speak of things between man and man, of things that tend to destroy human society, he is beside the question; if concerning matters of worship of God, it is an hard thing to determine more than that there is a God. The sun may be that God. The moon may be that God. To frame a right conception or notion of the First Being, wherein all other things had their being, is not possible by the light of nature alone.<sup>59</sup>

Wildman speaks for the Levellers, and it is unlikely that sectarian spokesmen, far less sophisticated, would have defined the limitations of natural law in quite this way. Yet some of them knew that the magistrate was tied to "the law of Nature only; and of this so far only, as either it clearly dictateth or prescribeth the doing of such things, which have a rational connexion with the welfare, honor, and prosperity of that community of men, which is under his inspection." This was, in fact, the basis of the alliance between the two groups. Baptist tracts in particular spelled out this theme, sometimes with references to Acts 18:14 where Gallio's refusal to judge Paul was laid to his appreciation of the correct demarcation between the spiritual and civil realms.<sup>60</sup> Baptist alertness to these issues was partly a response to the challenge of the Fifth Monarchy to their ranks. Often their leaders had to warn against theocratic appeals and reaffirm that separation of church and state rested on God's will that society should be governed by laws available to natural mind and conscience. The two errors condemned in the letter of the London Baptists to their Irish brethren typified this vigilance:

1st. That it was the duty of the magistrate to own their power to be received immediately from Jesus Christ. From this consequence would have unavoidably followed, that they were only accountable to Christ for their actions, and not to men . . . But the second thing held forth with great zeal by those friends was that the great rule by which they were to act in their proceedings towards the making of war or peace with the nations, should arise from a spirit stirred up, as they say, by God, to throw down potentates and powers, rather than those prudential rules of justice and righteousness, in the doing to all men as they would men should do to them.<sup>61</sup>

Thus, two widely disparate interpretations of separation of church and state existed side by side among Interregnum sectaries. Which exhibited greater strength? This is difficult to answer because, curiously, the two conceptions sometimes mingled in a manner which defies logical analysis. Such, for instance, was the interest of some Levellers in the personal reign of Christ on earth and conversely, the talk of some theocrats about social equality and democratic rule.<sup>62</sup> But on the whole, the theocratic appeal may have exercised the greater influence. The historical situation seemed to demand it. After the army's seizure

of power, England assumed a form crudely approximate to theocracy. And political realities tended to compel even those who opposed theocracy in theory to defer to it in practice. The nation plainly condemned the ascendancy of the Puritan radicals, and therefore it was paradoxically true that only the rule of the saints could preserve that degree of separation which had been achieved. Even Roger Williams, theologian of separation *par excellence*, appreciated these realities and made no effort to promote Rhode Island democracy in England. In a larger context, in fact, this was Cromwell's great problem, and one which continually thwarted his genuine desire for a constitutional settlement. In a revealing passage at the opening of the Little Parliament, the Protector mirrored all these attitudes of Puritanism in the presence of the theocratic idea—satisfaction, acquiescence, distrust:

You have been passive in coming hither, being called. . . . And therefore I may say also, never a people so formed, for such a purpose, so called—if it were a time to compare your standing with those that have been called by the suffrages of the people. Who can tell how soon God may fit the people for such a thing; and none can desire it more than I! Would all the Lord's people were prophets. I would all were fit to be called, and fit to call.<sup>63</sup>

And in the end Cromwell's reluctant decision was also the reluctant decision of even those sectaries who successfully resisted the enticements of theocracy for its own sake. The admission of the Baptist Richardson could not have been more frank:

There is no ground to believe that the people of this Nation would ever have given us this freedom . . . seeing the Ministers and Magistrate cannot see that the bond betwixt Magistrate and people is essentially civil: I see therefore no way to enjoy this freedom but from God; in this way therefore we should as gladly accept of it as good newes from a far country.<sup>64</sup>

This embarrassment was temporarily to prevent what was to be the sectarian contribution to the free church tradition. But already the hour was late when Richardson wrote. The environment was soon to change, and when it did, affecting Puritan Right as well as Left, the crystallization of the Nonconformist attitude would quickly follow.

## V.

The Restoration did not make any creative contribution to the further elaboration of the free church conception. Slight in its revolutionary impact when compared with that of 1640, it left religious realities unchanged. It is true that Puritan churches declined in size and that a fluid Interregnum Puritanism rigidified into more clearly defined denominational connexions. But religious variety remained dominant, and the four dissenting bodies, with later additions, became permanent factors in British history. Yet by its very occurrence, the Restoration eliminated certain possibilities and emphasized others so as to bring the free church conception into clearer focus.

Its first service in this direction was to shatter the theocratic interpretation of church-state separation. This interpretation had thrived to the end of the Interregnum. It even had its heyday in 1659 when, after Cromwell's death, a commonwealth governed by a coalition of saints seemed about to become a reality. In this outburst of theocratic enthusiasm even Quakers had joined, and not only by "testimonies" but by half agreeing to shoulder magisterial responsibilities as well.<sup>65</sup> But the nation's swift slide toward Restoration put an end to this optimism. Within months after that event the depth of national rejoicing made it apparent that an actual theocracy was even more remote than it had been to sectaries of Elizabeth's time. In this intellectual crisis, attitudes of theocrats varied. Some, as inflexible as they were desperate, appealed to arms. These produced Venner's insurrection of 1661 and the later conspiracies in which Baptist ex-officers played a conspicuous part. Others went to the opposite extreme, of deep disillusionment. Their name was legion, but Anthony Pearson, the Quaker architect of theocracy who made his peace with Anglicanism, provides the most spectacular example. Between these extremes, still other reactions appeared. Bunyan's writings spoke for scores of sectaries who found relief in an extravagant but politically innocuous millenarianism, while the whole Quaker movement, convulsed with agonizing self-examination, underwent a transformation which terminated in its withdrawal from the world, thus providing history with its one English example of classic sectarianism. But another shift must have been to a separationism which availed itself of the services of natural law. The prominence of this theme in subsequent Baptist history is clear. And there is evidence that even Quakers, after the passage of several generations and the cooling of their primitive mysticism, approached concepts of natural law as well.<sup>66</sup>

But the purgative effect of the Restoration on the outlook of right-wing Puritanism was equally, though less instantly, felt. At first everything seemed to point to the victory of the Presbyterian idea of accommodation, this time with Anglicanism. The work of the Convention Parliament, the pledges of the king, the amiability of Anglican spokesmen—all seemed to forecast the resurrection of the English church with only partially diminished comprehensiveness. But the sweeping reaction ministered to high church intransigence, and in the end all compromise was repudiated. Instead Anglicanism adopted an almost sectarian exclusiveness. This new spirit was clearly expressed by Richard Watson:

Though I reverence the Church of England . . . yet I am not so fond of her as to follow her in all her little policies of complying with all Protestants . . . and varnishing her articles with words capable of two senses to cement different opinions. . . . The more I look into antiquity,



the more I discover the partiality and fraud of many forsooth our reverend divines, unworthy hypocrites as they were, and foul imposters.<sup>67</sup>

Thus Anglicanism became, as I. Deane Jones has remarked, England's "Great Sect," compelled ultimately to recognize the existence of other religious loyalties in the nation.<sup>68</sup> In a sense this was already evident in the ecclesiastical legislation of the 1660's, only superficially akin to the Elizabethan acts, for the machinery set up by the Clarendon Code was directed less to the preservation of uniformity than to persecution of dangerous competitors in the interests of the triumphant denomination.

All this put an end to Presbyterian ambitions for accommodation, but relinquishment of the ideal was slow. For well over a decade Presbyterians pleaded for an "honorable" comprehension and continued to attend parish churches. Their attitude was that of Philip Henry: "I do not conform to the liturgy and its requirements as a minister, that I may bear my testimony against Prelacy; but I do conform in part as a private worshipper in the assembly, that I may bear my testimony against Independency."<sup>69</sup> But, deprived of all encouragement, such an attitude could not be maintained forever. Henry himself took out a license to preach under the indulgence of 1672, and in the same year the first Presbyterian ordination since the Restoration occurred. In fact, without parishes, presbyteries, or national organization, Presbyterianism was fast becoming almost indistinguishable from Independency. Probably the failure of the Comprehension Bill in 1689 gave the *coup de grâce* to accommodation as a live issue in conservative Puritanism, while the later collapse of Presbyterianism removed even the debris.

But 1689 also saw the passage of the Toleration Act, and this in some measure encouraged the Independent approach to church-state relations. Throughout the Restoration era, Owen and others had suggested that the true Church of England was the Christian nation and that in excluding large sections of this "church" Anglicanism was guilty of schism. Accordingly, Independency was ultimately concerned, not with amalgamating with a dominant party, but with bringing the state to abandon its exclusive support of the advocates of episcopacy. Thus Independency possessed a program which was not only in accord with the actual piecemeal relaxation of Anglican monopoly which developed after 1689, but which also made possible practical co-operation with the more sweeping philosophy of the Nonconformist congregations on its left.

But most of this came later. Actually, it was survival rather than any larger ambitions which absorbed the energies of early Dissent, and it was not until the nineteenth century that its expression on church-state connections assumed any very positive accents. Yet

within a quarter-century of the Restoration, the Nonconformist concept of a free church had attained its final form. This form was not unitary, but made allowance for ideas of both separation and "Christianity's common light" in its view of civil authority.<sup>70</sup> Further unification that view never achieved. Throughout modern British—and American—history the two strands ran side by side in the life of the Puritan denominations. Theoretically, the gulf between the two conceptions was unbridgeable, but in practice they were fused in a typically English amalgam. This amalgam was to be enduring. It is true that changes of emphasis occurred, especially in the greater scope later given to the sectarian contribution to the tradition. Most strikingly, the United States early established a constitutional separation, while similarly, nineteenth-century England saw the rise of a militant separationism, dominant in great Nonconformist leaders and victorious in the refusal in 1851 of the *Regium Donum*, the crown's annual subsidy to the dissenting denominations.<sup>71</sup> But the more conservative element was quiet, not dead. The American experiment emerged as a "separation" which included tax-exemption for churches, congressional and military chaplaincies, and official observance of the Christian calendar, while the conservative denominations taught allegiance to a broadly confessional republic where "Moses and Aaron united in counsel."<sup>72</sup> And in England the passing of the aggressive phase and the embarrassment of the twentieth-century Free Churches with their disestablishmentarian heritage suggested that the prevailing confessional commitment of the state, limited and unoppressive, might not be too distant from certain emphases of their own tradition.

Note: Research for this essay was aided by a grant from the University of Minnesota Graduate School.

1. Charles Gore, cited in Humphrey J. T. Johnson, *Anglicanism in Transition* (London, 1938), p. 195. There is a small and inadequate literature on denominationalism in America. The only satisfactory account of the concept in England is Winthrop S. Hudson, "Denominationalism as a basis for ecumenicity: a seventeenth century conception," *Church History*, Vol. XXIV, No. 1 (March, 1955), pp. 32-50.
2. A. F. Scott Pearson, *Church and state* (Cambridge, 1928), especially pp. 9-40, 106.
3. Perry Miller, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts* (Cambridge, 1933) p. 265, quoting Thomas Shepard and John Allin, *A defence of the answer* (London, 1648), p. 16.
4. Pearson, p. 116. Ernst Troeltsch, *Social Teachings of the Christian Churches* (London, 1931), II, 656 ff.
5. M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* (Chicago, 1939), pp. 253-255; Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (London, 1696), Part I, p. 83. The group to which Lilburne attached himself is described in William Kiffin, *Remarkable passages in the life of William Kiffin* (1823), p. 10.
6. This inner conflict is lucidly displayed in Henry Burton, *The protestation protested* (1641), especially pp. 11-20.
7. Pearson, pp. 9-10, 15, 23.
8. Stephen Marshall, *A sermon preached before the honourable house of commons now assembled in parliament, at their publicke fast, November 17, 1640* (London, 1641), p. 40; Thomas Hobbes, *Behemoth* (1680), p. 28.
9. *An apologeticall narration* (London, 1643), p. 15; Henry Martyn Dexter, *Congregationalism of the last three hundred years* (New York, 1880), p. 651, quoting Richard Baxter, *True history of councils*, p. 90.
10. Williston Walker, *Creds and plat-*

- forms of Congregationalism (New York, 1893), p. 78; Leonard Busher, *Religious peace* (1646), p. 56.
11. Champlin Burrage, *The church covenant idea* (Philadelphia, 1904), pp. 46-47.
  12. William T. Whitley (ed.) *The works of John Smyth* (Cambridge, 1915), II, 755-756. For early Baptist history, see W. T. Whitley, *A history of British Baptists* (London, 1923) and A. C. Underwood, *A history of English Baptists* (London, 1947).
  13. *Works of John Smyth*, I, 267.
  14. *Ibid.*, I, 166.
  15. Walker, p. 71; Knappen, p. 307.
  16. W. K. Jordan, *The development of religious toleration in England* (London, 1932-1940); T. Lyon, *Theory of religious liberty in England 1603-39* (Cambridge, 1937).
  17. Lyon, p. 122. Italics mine.
  18. *Works of John Smyth*, II, 748; Lyon, pp. 119-133.
  19. Lyon, p. 113.
  20. John Bruce (ed.), *Notes of the treaty carried on at Ripon* ("Camden Society Publications," C [Westminster, 1859]), p. 77.
  21. There is almost nothing on Episcopal Puritanism. On Congregationalism the standard histories, Dexter's volume mentioned above and R. W. Dale, *History of English Congregationalism* (London, 1907), are still useful. On the trend toward Presbyterianism, see the suggestive article by Winthrop Hudson, "The Scottish effort to Presbyterianize the Church of England during the early months of the Long Parliament," *Church History*, VIII (1939), 255-282.
  22. David Laing (ed.) *The letters and journals of Robert Baillie* (Edinburgh, 1841), II, 195.
  23. *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, Part II, p. 150; Robert S. Boshier, *The making of the Restoration settlement* (Westminster, 1951), p. 35.
  24. Boshier, p. 39.
  25. John Rushworth, *Historical collections* (1721-22), IV, 174; Richard Overton, *The arraignment of Mr. Persecution* (London, 1645).
  26. Thomas Edwards, *Reasons against the Independent government* (1641), "Epistle dedicatory," unpag.
  27. Jordan, III, 322-323.
  28. *Ibid.*, pp. 316-346.
  29. *Apologeticall Narration*, p. 15 ff.
  30. Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan faith and experience* (Oxford, 1947). For an account of this same tension in American Congregationalism, see my "The heart of New England rent: The mystical element in early Puritan history," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. XLII, No. 4, (March, 1956), pp. 621-652.
  31. *Works of John Robinson* (Boston, 1851), I, xlv; Burrage, p. 79; *Apologeticall Narration*, pp. 10-11.
  32. John Cook, *What the Independents would have* (1647). [John Owen], *The Works of John Owen* (ed. William H. Goold) (London, 1851), VIII, 401-426 for an example. For a typical utterance (to the Little Parliament), see Wilbur Cortez Abbott (ed.), *The writings and speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (Cambridge, 1937-45), III, 62: "Have a care of the whole flock! Love the sheep, love the lambs... And if the poorest Christian, the most mistaken Christian shall desire but to lead a life of godliness and honesty, let him be protected." Nuttall, p. 97.
  33. Jeremiah Burroughes, *Irenicum to the lovers of truth and peace* (London, 1646), p. 26.
  34. A. S. P. Woodhouse (ed.) *Puritanism and liberty* (Chicago, 1951), pp. 143, 153-154; Owen, *Works*, VIII, 386; Walker, pp. 393-394. A good statement of Owen's conservatism is found in John Owen, *Unto the questions sent me last night* (London, 1659).
  35. *The Ancient bounds, or liberty of conscience* (London, 1645), pp. 10-11.
  36. Osmund Airy (ed.), *Burnet's history of my own time* (Oxford, 1897), I, 114.
  37. Abbott, III, 459.
  38. Carl Stephenson and Frederick George Marcham (eds.), *Sources of English constitutional history* (New York, 1937), p. 528.
  39. John Stoughton, *History of Religion in England* (New York, 1882), II, 89.
  40. Dale, pp. 320 ff.
  41. Quoted in Boshier, pp. 7-8.
  42. Abbott, III, 834. Compare the decision of a Congregational council in London 1659: "Though we greatly prize our christian liberties, yet we profess our utter dislike and abhorrence of a Universal Toleration." John Browne, *History of Congregationalism and memorials of the churches in Norfolk and Suffolk* (London, 1877), p. 225.
  43. Underwood, pp. 80-81; *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, Part I, p. 72.
  44. Stoughton, II, 228, 200-204. Some Congregational clergymen gathered churches out of the parishes which they served as ministers of the Establishment.
  45. E. Rogers (ed.), *Some account of the life and opinions of a Fifth-Monarchy man* (London, 1867), p. 214.
  46. Abbott, IV, 495-496. See *ibid.*, III, 459 for another characteristic expression in 1654: "Is not Liberty of Conscience in religion a fundamental? So long as there is liberty of conscience

- for the supreme magistrate to exercise his conscience in erecting what form of church-government he is satisfied he should set up, why should not he give it to others? Liberty of conscience is a natural right; and he that would have it ought to give it, having liberty to settle what he likes for the public."
47. See Nuttall, *passim*, but especially pp. 96-97, 113 ff. E. B. Underhill, *Confessions of faith* (London, 1854), p. 59.
  48. Rogers, p. 215; *A declaration of the army of England upon their march into Scotland* (1650), pp. 9-10.
  49. Louise Fargo Brown, *The political activities of the Baptists and Fifth-Monarchy Men* (Washington, 1912), pp. 137-139.
  50. See the discussion in Whitley, pp. 70-71, and Underwood, pp. 80-81.
  51. On Tombs, see *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 1917), Vol. XIX. H. C. Vedder, *A short history of the Baptists* (Philadelphia, 1907), p. 61, quoting *A declaration of several of the people called Anabaptists in and about the city of London* (1659): "Whereas we are further charged with endeavoring an universal toleration of all misarrriage, both in things religious and civil, under pretence of liberty of conscience it is, in both respects, notoriously false... Nor do we desire in matters of religion, that Popery should be tolerated... nor any persons tolerated that worship a false god; nor any that speak contemptuously and reproachfully of our Lord Jesus Christ; nor any that deny the Holy Scriptures... to be the word of God. And yet we are not against tolerating of Episcopacy, Presbyters, or any stinted form, provided they do not compel others to a compliance therewith."
  52. Rogers, p. 127; Underwood, pp. 80-81.
  53. *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, Part I, p. 53.
  54. Wilhelm Schenk, *The concern for social justice in the Puritan Revolution* (London, 1948), throughout, but especially pp. 132-141.
  55. *A declaration of several of the churches of Christ* (London, 1654), p. 5.
  56. Woodhouse, p. 245.
  57. Underhill, pp. 333-334, Rogers, pp. 51, 54-55, 67, 205, 206.
  58. Woodhouse, "Introduction," *Puritanism and liberty*.
  59. Woodhouse, p. 161.
  60. John Goodwin, *Thirty queries* (London, 1653), p. 3. For use of Acts 18:14, see *Sions groans for her distressed* (1661) in *Tracts on liberty of conscience* (London, 1846), p. 360.
  61. Underhill, pp. 324-325. Note also *ibid.*, p. 329: "Though the saints, as such, are not to expect an interest and share in the government of the world, until the good day aforesaid [that day in which the Lord Jesus shall visibly descend from heaven in power and great glory]; yet in the capacity of honest and faithful men, they ought, when called thereunto, to yield their best assistance in and about the management of the civil government and kingdoms or commonweals."
  62. Schenk, pp. 74, 139.
  63. Abbott, III, 64.
  64. Samuel Richardson, *Plain dealing* (London, 1656), p. 5.
  65. J. F. Maclear, "Quakerism and the end of the Interregnum; a chapter in the domestication of radical Puritanism," *Church History*, Vol. XIX, No. 4 (December, 1950).
  66. J. C. Brauer, "Puritan mysticism and the development of liberalism," *Church History*, Vol. XIX, No. 3 (September, 1950).
  67. Bosher, pp. 57-58.
  68. I. Deane Jones, *The English Revolution* (London, 1931), p. 125.
  69. Quoted in A. H. Drysdale, *A History of the Presbyterians in England* (London, 1889), pp. 420-422.
  70. An early instance of the mingling of the two concepts can be seen in Baxter's statement, quoted Jordan, III, 173. "I think that land most happy whose rulers use their authority for Christ, as well as for the civil peace; yet in comparison of the rest of the world, I shall think that land that hath but bare liberty to be as good as they are willing to be; and if countenance and maintenance be but added to liberty, and tolerated errors and sects be but forced to keep the peace... I shall not hereafter much fear such toleration nor despair that truth will bear down adversaries."
  71. H. W. Clark, *History of English Non-conformity from Wickliff to the close of the nineteenth century* (London, 1911-13), II, 414-415.
  72. I expect to publish an essay on this subject, "The true American union of church and state" in the near future.

## PAPAL FINANCE AND THE TEMPORAL POWER, 1815-1871

RONDO E. CAMERON, *University of Wisconsin*

The Popes of Rome ruled as both temporal and spiritual sovereigns for more than one thousand years, but historians have been little concerned with the former aspect of their sovereignty except as a factor in international politics and diplomacy and for its effect upon their status as heads of Catholic Christendom. Details of the internal administration of the States of the Church have been largely neglected. This state of affairs is particularly true with respect to the modern and recent periods of European history, during which the rise of great national states eclipsed the tiny temporal domain of the Pope. There is a substantial literature on the finances of the Papacy in the later Middle Ages, when finance is recognized as having played an important part in political affairs, but a survey of the literature for the modern period fails to reveal any systematic treatment of the subject.<sup>1</sup> There is reason to believe, however, as this brief note indicates, that there is a significant connection between the financial situation of the States of the Church and the loss of the temporal power. It is even possible that this connection extends to matters of Church doctrine.

The present note does not purport to be a complete account of Papal finance from the Congress of Vienna to the fall of the temporal power. It deals only with one aspect of that subject, borrowing and the public debt, and that primarily from the point of view of the Pope's relations with France. However, inasmuch as France not only played a key role in the events leading up to the loss of the temporal domain of the Papacy, but was also its most important and dependable creditor in the half-century preceding that event, its part would bulk large in any account of Papal finances for the period under review.<sup>2</sup>

### I

The Popes of the Middle Ages had been among the first heads of state to have recourse to public credit, and their borrowings contributed in several respects to the rise of economic institutions which subsequently were termed "capitalistic." At the end of the eighteenth century the debts of the States of the Church amounted to approximately 400 million francs,<sup>3</sup> but by 1815 they had been reduced to less than a fourth of that amount by both Papal repudiation and the ruthless financial administration of the Napoleonic government.<sup>4</sup> For a dozen years after the Congress of Vienna, the Papal government enjoyed financial order and budget surpluses which allowed it to reduce still further its public debt, and by more acceptable means. But in



1828 the deficit recurred and became a more or less permanent feature of Papal finance until the end of the temporal rule.

The revolts which broke out in 1831-32 put a severe strain on the Roman treasury, and sent the head of Catholic Christendom for the first time to one of those "five gentlemen from Frankfort" who was later to be recognized as the leader of international Jewry. Baron James de Rothschild, chief of the banking house of that name in Paris, had already—along with his brothers—shown his devotion to the cause of stability and order as established by the Congress of Vienna. Apart from transmitting British subsidies to Britain's Continental allies and performing other services for the coalition in the last and victorious onslaught against Napoleon, they had played the leading role in the restoration of Austrian finances after the wars and had furnished the financial support necessary for putting down the revolution of 1820-21 in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies.<sup>5</sup> James, youngest of the five brothers, first came to Paris in 1812 to handle the operations of the family consortium at the seat of the French government. He stayed on after the Restoration, and by 1820 had already penetrated into the inner circles of French finance. Having made his peace with the July Monarchy (with which, in truth, he was more sympathetic than with its predecessor), and being located in the leading financial market on the Continent, he was at the time of the revolts of 1831-32 in the best position of any financier to come to the aid of the Pope. From that time until 1859 he was the chief financial support and agent of the Papacy.

Despite the assistance of Rothschild, the most extreme disorder ruled in the financial administration of the Church during the pontificate of Gregory XVI. The finances were administered by prelates of the Church who were entitled to elevation to the rank of cardinal upon quitting office.<sup>6</sup> Their accounts were not subject to audit, and their actions were liable to review only by the Pope himself. From 1833 to 1846 there were no published accounts of the state of the treasury; after 1837 there were no records from which an account could later be constructed.<sup>7</sup> Upon the accession of Pius IX, in 1846, it was determined (after a fashion) that the funded debt amounted to more than 200 million francs and the floating debt to between 40 and 50 million francs<sup>8</sup>—the latter being a sum equivalent to the annual budget. Altogether the borrowings under Gregory, most of which had been provided by Rothschild, came to about 150 million francs.<sup>9</sup>

With the accession of Pius IX, a new dawn was hailed by liberal Catholics everywhere. Believed to be of liberal sympathies himself, *Pio Nono* almost certainly intended to institute thoroughgoing reforms throughout his administration. A beginning was made in finances by attempting to bring some order to the accounts of his

predecessor, and for the purpose of consolidating the floating debt a small loan was contracted with the Catholic banking firm of Delahante and Company in Paris.<sup>10</sup> Unfortunately for this attempt, Delahante failed during the Paris uprising of February, 1848, before the issue of the loan had been completed, and shortly thereafter the revolutionary wave enveloped Rome itself.

The revolutionary governments, first the constitutional ministry which functioned under Pius and later that of the short-lived republic, met their current needs by the issue of treasury bonds, and the republican government issued inconvertible paper currency as well. From the outbreak of the revolutionary movement to the forcible repression of the republic in July, 1849, the total deficit amounted to about 30 million francs. Some of this debt was eliminated upon the restoration of the Papal government by the simple expedient of repudiating a part of the issue of paper money. But scarcely had this taken place when the restored government itself resorted to the issue of paper.<sup>11</sup>

Once the Papal party was back in power it became necessary to liquidate the costs of the insurrection and subsequent restoration, and to provide for the permanent occupation forces of Austria and France. For this purpose, a new loan of 50 million francs was undertaken, with the Pope returning in this time of troubles to the reliable James de Rothschild. Like the other issues which were held in France, this one yielded interest of 5 per cent on the nominal capital; it was taken at 75 per cent of par by Rothschild in the spring of 1850, and subsequently issued to the public by him at prices ranging upward from 78 per cent of par.<sup>12</sup> A small additional issue of this same series, amounting to a nominal value of 6,450,000 francs, was made in 1854.<sup>13</sup> The previous year Rothschild had also furnished the Pope with 26 million francs for the purpose of liquidating the issues of paper money, for which he received in return non-negotiable bonds bearing 8 per cent interest.<sup>14</sup>

A semblance of order having been restored to Papal finances by the middle years of the decade 1850-59, the government, acting on the advice of Baron James, decided on a consolidation of all loans which had been issued through the House of Rothschild in order to lighten the immediate burden of amortization payments. A convention to this effect was signed in 1857, and Rothschild proceeded immediately with the exchange of the securities. The total value of the issue was 142,425,000 francs in securities with a face value of 1000 francs paying interest of 5 per cent.<sup>15</sup> In the absence of fuller evidence, it may be assumed that this was the amount of French investment in the public debt of the States of the Church just prior to the War of 1859. Since the total debts of the Pope amounted to approximately 350 million francs on January 1, 1858,<sup>16</sup> the part of France was in excess of 40 per cent. Moreover, since all but 10 million francs of the foreign-held

debt were in the form of the Rothschild certificates,<sup>17</sup> it can be said that virtually the full amount of the public debt of the States of the Church which was not held internally was in the hands of the French.

The remainder, almost 200 million francs, seems a very large amount to be owned by the inhabitants of a state as small, poorly endowed, and economically retarded as were the States of the Church. In fact, very little of this was a "public debt" in the technical sense. Some of it, it is true, resulted from loans made to the Pope or the Papal government by individual citizens of the States of the Church; a somewhat larger amount<sup>18</sup> was due the Banca Romana, the official state bank, for advances it had made to the government.<sup>19</sup> But by far the largest part of this internal "debt" represented the capitalized value of pensions and other bequests which the Pope or his government had granted to institutions and individuals, and which were paid from current income.

According to the classical political economists, whose doctrines were widely known in the more advanced countries of that time, the "legitimate" functions of government included defense (war), justice, education, and the provisions of works of public utility which it would not be in the interests of private individuals to undertake.<sup>20</sup> On the whole, they opposed public indebtedness, but conceded that there might be occasions for "extraordinary" expenditure, particularly in case of war, which might justify it.<sup>21</sup> Their theories did not, of course, allow for such an anomaly in the modern state system as the government of the Pope: it was not restricted to ordinary forms of taxation and borrowing for its revenue, nor to the ordinary functions of government for its expenditure. Perhaps a logical extension of the theory would indicate that the tax revenues should have been restricted to cover only the ordinary government operations, and the other income of the Church for its religious functions. But if such an extension is valid in theory, it was rarely the case in fact. In practice the accounts were not kept separate, and taxes might be used to support the international commitments of the Church, or (more rarely) gifts to the Church used for carrying out governmental functions at Rome. In any case, given the nature and attitude of the government of the Pope, very few of its resources, regardless of whether they were obtained from gifts, taxation, or borrowing, were devoted to purposes of economic development. Only a tiny fraction of the total public debt, estimated at less than 5 million francs, had gone for such purposes as road construction, drainage, and irrigation.<sup>22</sup> Fully one third had been spent for "purely clerical" purposes having no connection with the Roman state.<sup>23</sup> The remainder had been used for suppressing rebellion and maintaining foreign troops in the country.

## II

Scarcely had the Papacy achieved financial stability when the War of 1859 brought further disasters, financial as well as political, in its train. The province of Romagna, richest of the Pope's domains, revolted successfully as soon as Austria withdrew its troops from Bologna, and Umbria and the Marches fell to Victor Emmanuel's army the following year. Deprived of the greater portion of its normal tax revenue, and with its expenses soaring from the cost of war, the flood of displaced clerics streaming into Rome, and the "unparalleled wastage"<sup>24</sup> of the financial administration, the government of the Pope made a desperate appeal for financial assistance in "all the capitals of Europe."<sup>25</sup> A loan of 50 million francs was authorized in April, 1860, of which it was hoped one half would be raised in France.<sup>26</sup>

Angered at Rothschild for the support which he lent to Victor Emmanuel and Cavour,<sup>27</sup> the Pope determined to issue his securities without the aid of any banker, Jew or Christian.<sup>28</sup> The proceeds of the loan, which he hoped to issue at par, were to be collected in each diocese by the "local agents of the Pope" (i.e., the bishops), and forwarded to Rome by the Papal Nuncio in Paris.<sup>29</sup> At this point, however, the French minister of finance intervened. The procedure, he complained to the minister of foreign affairs, was quite irregular and without precedent, and he could not assent to the issue of the securities in France until a recognized banker was appointed as intermediary for the collection and forwarding of the proceeds.<sup>30</sup> There were, moreover, other irregularities to which the minister objected: in the event of an oversubscription, the Pope intended to use the proceeds for the repayment of outstanding obligations without having so stated in the public announcements. Having no alternative but to comply with the suggestions of the minister of finance, Pius issued a "special regulation for the issue of the loan in France" and appointed two reliable Catholic bankers, Edward Blount and the Marquis de la Bouillerie, as his agents.<sup>31</sup>

In the public announcements of the loan (as well, no doubt, as in the diocesan missives of the bishops), the point was stressed that it was the religious duty and privilege of Catholics to support the loan with their pecuniary as with their spiritual resources. The appeal was not without effect, for the financial world was astounded to see subscriptions actually being made at face value when other Papal loans were being quoted at a discount of 25 per cent. (The first public quotations on the loan of 1860, when it was admitted to the Bourse three years later, ranged from 73 to 77 per cent of par.) But despite this financial miracle, the Papal expectations were not fully realized, as only 37 of the hoped for 50 million francs were subscribed. French Catholics furnished 17 of the 25 million asked of them.<sup>32</sup>

The position of the finance minister in the government of the Pope in the 1860's was not an enviable one. In a state with an area and population less than that of a small German duchy, he was called upon to service a debt which ranked in size with those of some of the major powers of Europe. It is true that immediately upon annexing the former provinces of the Pope, the new government of Italy had taken over service on the securities held by the inhabitants of Romagna, Umbria, and the Marches; but that was only a small part of the total. Not until 1867, as the result of treaties in which France acted as an intermediary between the government of Rome and that of Italy, did the latter assume a proportionate amount of the debts attributable to the annexed provinces.<sup>33</sup> In the meantime, the ordinary expenses of government as well as the service of the debt had to be met for the most part from gifts and donations, which failed to materialize in the expected amounts. The total receipts from "Saint Peter's pence" for the years 1859-62 were scarcely enough to cover the deficit for one.<sup>34</sup>

Early in 1863 the Pope requested the French government to authorize his agents to call for the "remainder" (eight million francs) of the loan of 1860.<sup>35</sup> Instead of opening a public subscription at par value as in the initial instance, however, the Pope preferred to address directly to the holders of the 1860 securities "on terms advantageous to themselves"<sup>36</sup> (i.e., they would be allowed to purchase the new securities at the going market rate of five francs of *rente* for 74 francs of capital). The finance minister on this occasion made no objection, but he stressed that this time the operation must be "purely financial" with no participation by or propaganda from the bishops.<sup>37</sup> Despite warnings and injunctions, however, the zealous representatives of the Holy Father could not be constrained to separate religion from finance. The Bishop of Autun urged his flock to support the new issue in a pastoral letter in which he pointed out that "all in doing a good work, the faithful . . . will at the same time be making an advantageous investment," and went on to assure them that the Pope was a "good risk."<sup>38</sup> The editors of the Parisian journal *La Presse* commented that the language of the letter might cause some astonishment to Saint Paul and Saint James, whose own epistles to their churches "had no connection with the *Guide du spéculateur à la Bourse*."<sup>39</sup> The finance minister, Achille Fould, protested this breach of faith in a letter to the foreign minister,<sup>40</sup> but by that time the operation had been completed and the matter was allowed to drop.

The following year a group of Catholic bankers and financiers, Edward Blount and the deputy Henri Barbet among them, projected a scheme in conjunction with Papal officials whereby repayment of the foreign-held debt would be assured regardless of the revenues of the Papacy. A new loan of 100 million francs involving lottery features



was to be issued at 90 per cent of par. Approximately one half of the proceeds were to be placed in a sinking fund under the management of the French bankers; the income of the fund would be used to repurchase on the Bourse the outstanding issues of Papal securities then in the hands of French holders.<sup>41</sup> Since the securities of the new loan were not intended for public dealings on the Bourse, the active support of the Imperial government was not requested, but only "its agreement or at least tacit tolerance."<sup>42</sup> Even this could not be granted, however, according to the finance minister, as all lottery loans were prohibited by law.<sup>43</sup>

Within a few months the finance ministry received a request from the Banque de Cr dit Foncier et Industriel of Brussels, which along with Blount was charged with issuing a new loan of 50 million francs, to make announcement of the issue in the Parisian financial journals.<sup>44</sup> The minister had no time in which to make a decision, inasmuch as the notice appeared in the press even before he received the request.<sup>45</sup> Once again the agents of the Pope had run afoul of French law. Although both the finance minister and foreign minister expressed their "regret" to the Papal Nuncio, neither was inclined to take the steps allowed by law in such cases.<sup>46</sup> Despite this incident, the agents of the Church continued to be a source of irritation to the finance minister. As on previous occasions, the bishops insisted on making the loan of 1864 a test of religious faith. But on top of this a more serious issue for the French government, a subtle connection with dynastic politics, began to emerge—partly, no doubt, as a reaction to what the bishops must have considered the hostile attitude of the Imperial government. Blount, by now firmly established as the Pope's banker in Paris, was well known for his Orleanist sympathies, and most of the receivers of the loan in the provinces were also followers of the Orleanist or Legitimist factions. One of these, who was charged with receiving the proceeds of the loan throughout northeastern France, was described as "perfectly hostile to the Imperial government" and apparently had no other qualifications for his appointment than his pronounced royalist tendencies.<sup>47</sup>

Despite such incidents, the internal political situation of the Imperial government was such that the ministers of Napoleon III dared not refuse permission for the Pope to continue to borrow in France. In 1866 Blount issued 60 million francs (nominal value) in 5 per cent bonds at a price of 330 francs per bond of 500 francs face value.<sup>48</sup> There were, apparently, no untoward events to mar this transaction.

This proved to be the last time that a French administration had to concern itself with a Papal loan, although it was not the last of the troubles with the debts of the Church. In 1868 the Italian government levied a tax on the income of all government securities, including

those former debts of the Church which it had assumed the previous year. In the eyes of the foreign creditors this amounted to a partial repudiation of its obligations, inasmuch as the tax was deducted prior to the payment of interest. Among the hundreds of protests and demands for retaliatory action which deluged the government of the Emperor as a result of this action was one from a *père* Gostlin, a retired priest who owned a few hundred francs of the Papal *rente*, who directed a personal appeal to Napoleon III calling upon *him* to take over the service of the Papal debts.<sup>40</sup> This proposal apparently received no serious consideration, although the government did consider the possibility of removing all Italian securities from the privilege of the Bourse. But other and more pressing needs of state indicated a different course, and the government of France contented itself with lodging official protests with the government of Italy.

The temporal rule of the Pope came to an end in the events of 1870, and with that he was relieved of carrying the financial burdens of a territorial state. Although the "prisoner in the Vatican" refused to recognize or accept that Law of Guarantees of March 21, 1871, he did not object when, three months later, a bill was passed into law making the remaining debts of the Church obligations of the Kingdom of Italy.

### III.

The evidence presented in this brief survey of Papal finance appears to support the following limited generalizations: (1) the political difficulties in which the Papacy found itself in the last decades of the temporal power were reinforced by, and to some extent the result of, corresponding financial difficulties;<sup>40</sup> and (2) the conflicting interests within France which were responsible for the ambivalent attitude of its government with respect to the entire complex of the Italo-Roman problem were reinforced by pecuniary considerations, for citizens of France were even more heavily engaged in the finances of the Kingdom of Italy than in those of the government of the Pope. It is significant that *père* Gostlin, while distraught over the sacrilege committed by the Italian government in invading the States of the Church, was more immediately concerned that the Emperor take some action which would restore his income.

Can a more sweeping generalization be drawn from the history of Papal finance? Is it possible that the financial history of the States of the Church has any connection with doctrinal matters? There is nothing in the evidence to indicate such a connection; and in the nature of the case it is unlikely that any documentation can be found. The framers of the *Syllabus of Errors* would scarcely admit to others, even if they were conscious of it themselves, that their

condemnation of modern civilization and all its accoutrements had any connection with their own failure to make a temporal government function successfully in the circumstances of the modern world. But such a relationship is, at least, conceivable, and perhaps worthy of further investigation.

1. An authoritative and recently compiled bibliography of Italian economic history in the nineteenth century (*Bibliografia di storia economica italiana per il periodo 1840-1887*, mimeo., n.d., n.p.) lists only three titles, all insignificant, dealing with the public finances of the States of the Church. The monumental work of the Catholic historian Josef Schmidlin (*Papstgeschichte der Neuesten Zeit* [4 vols., Munich, 1933-39]) devotes exactly one paragraph to public finance in the reign of Pius IX (1846-1878). Critics of the Church, such as J. B. Bury (*History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century, 1864-1878* [London, 1930]) are no more attentive to such mundane matters; there is, in fact, no mention whatever of finances in Bury, although it must be admitted that he was primarily interested in ideas rather than institutions. Carl C. Eckhardt, an historian who considered explicitly the Papacy as a world power (*The Papacy and World Affairs* [Chicago University Press, 1937]), likewise makes no mention of public finance. There are, in fact, only scattered references to be found in any work.
2. The latter part of this account is based on correspondence between the French Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs relative to the admission of foreign securities to the Paris Bourse. All documents cited are preserved in the Archives Nationales, Paris, in *série F<sup>90</sup>, liasse no. 309*, and will be further identified in the notes only by reference to writer, recipient, and date.
3. The franc (roughly equivalent to 20 cents U. S. currency in pre-1914 values) is used throughout this note to express monetary values, inasmuch as France, the "eldest [and wealthiest] daughter of the Church," was the source of virtually all its borrowings. For a brief survey of the debts of the Church see Isadore Sachs, *L'Italie, ses finances et son développement économique... 1859-1884* (Paris, 1885), pp. 452-458.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 452-453; "Modern Rome and the Papal Government," *Foreign Quarterly Review*, XI (1833), 662.
5. Cf. E. C. Corti, *The Rise of the House of Rothschild* (tr. B. & B. Lunn; New York and London, 1928). These are only two of a number of cases in which the Rothschilds were involved in support of Metternichian principles.
6. Luigi Carlo Farini, *The Roman State from 1815 to 1850* (tr. W. E. Gladstone; 4 vols.; London, 1851-54), I, 142. For a very different (Catholic) view of the financial administration in this period see "Italy and the Papal States," *Dublin Review*, XLI (1856), 171-226, which mentions "economical reforms and good management" that reduced the annual deficit "to only 350,000 dollars [scudi] by 1847."
7. Farini, *Roman State*, I, 143; Bolton King, *A History of Italian Unity* (2 vols.; 3rd impression revised; London, 1924), I, 74; *Annuaire de l'économie politique et de statistique* (54 vols.; Paris, 1844-98), 1851, 277-279; Sachs, *L'Italie*, p. 453. One of the officials of the treasury, when questioned on a matter of political economy, is said to have replied that he did not read books dealing with that subject, as they were "pernicious and on the Index" (King, *Italian Unity*, I, 75).
8. Sachs, *L'Italie*, p. 454. For purposes of comparison, the United States in 1846 had a population 7 times as great as that of the Papal States and an area 150 times as large; its budget for 1846 (which included a surplus three times as large as the Papal deficit of almost two million francs) was but three times as large, whereas its public debt was less than one third that of the States of the Church. The *per capita* public debt of the United States amounted to about 75 cents; that of the States of the Church to more than four dollars.
9. Farini, *Roman State*, I, 145.
10. *Ann. de l'écon. pol.*, 1851, p. 279.
11. *Ibid.*; Sachs, *L'Italie*, p. 454.
12. E. C. Corti, *The Reign of the House of Rothschild* (tr. B. & B. Lunn; London, 1928), p. 279n; *The Economist* (London), Feb. 2, 1850.
13. Sachs, *L'Italie*, p. 455; P.-J. Proudhon, *Manuel du spéculateur à la Bourse* (4th ed.; Paris, 1857), p. 427.
14. Sachs, *L'Italie*, p. 455.
15. Sachs, *L'Italie*, p. 456; Bourse de Paris, Chambre Syndicale, *Annuaire, 1880* (Paris, 1881), p. 179. Of this, 19,175,000 francs represented a net new issue. Some of the earlier issues

- had been partially amortized; total French purchases had almost certainly exceeded 150 million francs, possibly even 200 million.
16. Sachs, *L'Italie*, p. 456.
  17. *Ann. de l'écon. pol.*, 1859, p. 352.
  18. The information in this paragraph, it must be admitted, is largely guesswork based on casual and scattered references. Published accounts of the breakdown of the internal debt of the States of the Church are, to my knowledge, non-existent.
  19. The Banca Romana, wholly state owned, had been reorganized in 1852 with Count Philip Antonelli, brother of the Cardinal Secretary of State, as its director. Under inept and probably corrupt management, it issued large quantities of banknotes unbacked by any metallic reserve; it also suffered enormous losses which were covered by fictitious accounting entries. (R. de Cesare, *The Last Days of Papal Rome, 1850-1870* [London, 1909], pp. 38-39.)
  20. Cf. Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (Edinburgh, 1776), Book V, chap. I.
  21. *Ibid.*, Book V, chap. III; David Ricardo, *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* (Everyman ed.; London, 1911), p. 163.
  22. The States of the Pope became the first in Italy to introduce postage stamps, in 1852, but the workmen in the printing office where they were made sold large sheets wholesale at half price, and the postal clerks instead of cancelling the stamps as often as not removed them from letters and resold them for their personal profit. A telegraph installed between Rome and Terracina in 1854 was used mainly for sending devotional messages and for the entertainment of the official under whose direction it fell; not until 1857 did Rome have telegraphic communications with the outside world. Gas lights for the streets of Rome were installed upon the demand of the commander of the French occupation forces, who wished to protect his troops from the thugs and ruffians that prowled the streets at night. Concessions for railways were granted after 1854, but the government incurred no expense for subsidies until 1859.
  23. Sachs, *L'Italie*, p. 456.
  24. *Ibid.*
  25. French Minister of Finance (hereafter abbreviated as MinFin) to Minister of Foreign Affairs (MinForAff), April [n.d.] 1860.
  26. *Ibid.*
  27. The Paris House of Rothschild had also been the principal banker for the Kingdom of Sardinia, and had assisted in floating a new loan as recently as November, 1859. The first loan to be raised by the new Kingdom of Italy was also handled by Baron James. (Rondo E. Cameron, "French Finance and Italian Unity: The Cavourian Decade," *American Historical Review*, Vol. LXII, No. 3 [April, 1957].)
  28. In retaliation for being by-passed, Rothschild announced on December 1, 1860, the date on which payment of interest on the consolidated debts of 1857 should have been made, that the payments would be indefinitely postponed since he had not received from the Papal treasury the full amount necessary to service the debt (*Journal des chemins de fer*, XIX [Dec. 1, 1860], 963). On such occasions in the past he had always made temporary advances to cover the interest.
  29. MinFin to MinForAff, April [n.d.] 1860.
  30. *Ibid.*
  31. *Règlement spécial pour la France sur l'émission et la vente d'un emprunt*. . . . [etc.], dated May 25, 1860, and signed by Pius IX and his finance minister, Ferrani; Magne (MinFin) to E. Blount, June 21, 1860. Blount, although an Englishman by birth, had established himself in Paris during the regime of Louis Philippe and was closely identified with French finance throughout his long life.
  32. E. Drouyn de Lhuys (MinForAff) to A. Fould (MinFin), Feb. 23, 1863.
  33. Sachs, *L'Italie*, pp. 457-58, 465, 467.
  34. *Ibid.*, p. 456.
  35. MinForAff to MinFin, Feb. 23, 1863.
  36. *Ibid.*
  37. MinFin to MinForAff, March 6, 1863.
  38. Quoted in *La Presse*, May 10, 1863.
  39. *Ibid.*
  40. May 18, 1863.
  41. Confidential note of Drouyn de Lhuys to Fould, March 1, 1864.
  42. *Ibid.*
  43. On several occasions, the most notable being that in connection with Ferdinand de Lesseps' Suez Canal Company, the interested parties had obtained from the *Corps législatif* special exemptions from the anti-lottery law. Available documents do not reveal why the Pope did not attempt this solution.
  44. Letter dated June 14, 1864. The bank stated that its assistance was "purely gratuitous and motivated solely by the desire to be useful to the Pontifical government."
  45. *La Nation* (Paris), June 14, 1864. The Pontifical decree authorizing the loan was dated March 26, 1864.
  46. MinForAff to MinFin, July 2, 1864; MinFin to MinForAff, July 8, 1864.

47. Report of the prefect of the department of the Meurthe to the Minister of the Interior; Nancy, July 26, 1864.
48. Flavio Chigi (Papal Nuncio) to Drouyn de Lhuys, March 28, 1866; MinForAff to MinFin, April 6, 1866; MinFin to MinForAff, April 11, 1866.
49. *Père Gostlin*, missionary of St. Vincent's Seminary, to Napoleon III; Le Mans, June 24, 1869.
50. It is unlikely, for example, that the

citizens of the States of the Church would have so willingly abandoned their sovereign in 1848-49 and again in 1859-60 but for the heavy load of taxation from which they obtained no visible benefits. In another connection, had the Pope's representatives been less maladroit in their financial dealings in Paris, they would probably have found Napoleon's ministers more amiably disposed.



## HORATIO OLIVER LADD: A NEW ENGLAND CONSCIENCE FOR NEW MEXICO

FREDERICK G. BOHME, *University of New Mexico*

The decades of the 1870's and 1880's were times of increasing social consciousness on the part of the churches of the United States. The Civil War had been concluded, and the expansion of the nation within its own borders was resumed. All of the religious bodies—Protestant, Jewish, and Roman Catholic—were called upon to perform a task which neither the government nor any organized secular group was prepared to do: integrate literally millions of immigrants into the American way of life.

In the eastern United States the needs of an industrial economy and an already established society, aided by a growing public school system, more or less forced a similarity of purpose and "balance of power" among the various religions. In Spanish-speaking, Roman Catholic New Mexico, however, conditions were entirely different and this "balance" did not exist. In earlier years, Horace Bushnell had called for "railroads and telegraphs spinning into the wilderness,"<sup>1</sup> to integrate new territories with the rest of the nation. Many Protestant churchmen of this later period believed, however, that these means would not be enough to "Americanize" New Mexico, and that it could only be accomplished through their denominational schools.

The New England Congregationalists, through the New West Education Commission, were a major driving force in this movement. They felt that New England schools, together with their products of morality and ardent Americanism, were best fitted for this task. Charles R. Bliss wrote in his book, *The New West, New Mexico*, "The isolation of New Mexico is to cease. . . . They who have known the value of the New England Academy will deem that few means are better fitted than those to aid the important work in hand."<sup>2</sup> In a rather more romantic mood, and perhaps with an eye to his readers, President Edward Payson Tenney of Colorado College had eulogized:

And when we kneeled upon the flat roof of an adobe house at sunset to pray for the dark and gloomy land around us, we took courage in thinking that the same sun which illuminates the hills and vales of New Mexico shines upon happy homes of New England; and we prayed that the God of our New England would stir up the sons and daughters of the Pilgrims to plant the Christian schoolhouse and the Christian church in that portion of New Spain which is now a part of our common heritage.<sup>3</sup>

Here was a field for missionary endeavor in which Protestantism

and Americanism could be combined. Timothy Dwight, grandson and namesake of the famous President of Yale College, who became President of Yale University in his own right in 1886, hailed the coming years (in 1871) as an "age . . . of heroic earnestness."<sup>4</sup> It was this attitude which permeated the actions of such men as Horatio Oliver Ladd after they surveyed the problem before them.

While peoples from every land voluntarily entered the nation's ports and began the assimilation process, the country discovered within its own Southwestern borders a group of some 120,000 people<sup>5</sup> which had no industrial economy, no established society in the American sense, and apparently had little desire to become part of the nation. This was New Mexico—literally a foreign mission field for the Protestants of the eastern United States. Although the territory had been part of the Union for over a generation, its population was overwhelmingly Spanish-speaking and Roman Catholic; its Indians had been under the influence of the missionary fathers for centuries. (While no official figures are available for the period before 1890, the census of that year listed 105,749 church members in the Territory. Of these, 100,576 were of the Roman faith.)<sup>6</sup>

To other Americans in general, and New Englanders in particular, New Mexico was an ignorant, illiterate, and superstitious land under the control of a Church which had no desire to change the *status quo*. The Territory was likened to the kingdom of Spain and the Papal States of the early nineteenth century as an example of clerical autocracy.<sup>7</sup>

Not only was it charged that this rule was exercised through the pulpit and the confessional, but Protestant missionaries seldom tired of calling attention to the local school boards manned by priests, and the Territorial Board of Education which included, in addition to the Governor, the Territorial Secretary, and the Supreme Court judges, the Roman Catholic Bishop of New Mexico.<sup>8</sup>

The record of this educational system was not encouraging. In 1870, only about four out of every hundred school-age children actually attended a class.<sup>9</sup> The Protestant denominations readily saw that if they were to accomplish their "patriotic" task of Americanizing New Mexico, it would have to be done through the establishment of private schools, especially those of higher education. President Edward Payson Tenney of Colorado College equated Americanization and Protestantization when he wrote, "If Christianity is fundamental in elevating the race, the Christian college is the instrument through which to advance Christian civilization. . . . But if the college be infidel or jesuitical, morality is undermined, and the republic cannot stand."<sup>10</sup>

By 1870 the five public schools of the Territory had been joined by one college, three academies, and twenty-nine private schools. Not

without a spirit of competition, they were opened almost equally under Roman Catholic and Protestant auspices,<sup>11</sup> and these were soon followed by others.

One of the most important, the Santa Fe Academy, was incorporated in the New Mexican capital on July 24, 1878, under the sponsorship of the American College and Education Society. This organization had also aided and established such colleges as Oberlin, Marietta, Olivet, Ripon, and Colorado; and the New Mexican venture was a logical extension of its aim to build small denominational schools in strategic places all over the United States. William Gillet Ritch, the Secretary of the Territory, was elected president of the Academy's board of trustees, and Charles R. Bliss was installed as principal.<sup>12</sup> Under an agreement with the New West Education Commission, an arm of the Congregational Church, Bliss and the other necessary teachers were furnished to the school free of charge. Bliss subsequently left his post to take up duties with the New West Commission, and after a period of administration by Mr. William E. Strieby, a new principal was secured in 1880 who was to have profound effects on the educational situation in New Mexico.

The newcomer, Horatio Oliver Ladd (1839-1932), was a Congregational minister from Hopkinton, Massachusetts, and a former professor at Olivet College, Michigan. A graduate of the Yale Divinity School in 1863, he had been influenced by the educational philosophy of Timothy Dwight; yet it had taken seventeen years and the urgings of his classmate, President Tenney of Colorado College, to make him realize that he should put his theory to practical use on the frontier. Once aroused, his "New England conscience" impelled him to mould New Mexicans into the likeness of his Puritan forebears.

Ladd arrived in Santa Fe with his family on September 10, 1880, and opened the Fall term of the Academy five days later. He immediately surveyed the cultural situation in the capital, and optimistically wrote in an article for eastern readers:

The Roman Catholic religion is quietly dominant [in Santa Fe]. A thousand Americans have, however, large influence among such a people as this. They control the business, they introduce and forward the improvements now going on. . . .

Religious enterprise is here also now happily manifest among them. . . . So that it may be said that even in Santa Fe there are a few spirits earnest for Christ and souls, and the future of this country.<sup>13</sup>

Ladd had been instructed by the New West Commission to build a "University schoolhouse . . . or rather stir up the dilatory trustees to do so,"<sup>14</sup> but he found little commonality of cause among the residents of Santa Fe either as to the need for or nature of such an expanded school. Commenting on this in later years, Ladd wrote,

A frontier town [Santa Fe] so far removed from Eastern customs and influence, had few common standards, and every individual had to be enlisted if possible, singly, in matters of education, and in the development of character by higher moral and religious motives. . . . The foreign aspects of Santa Fe were attractive. I perceived a rough and ready ability, disciplined by frontier life, among the professional men and merchants and officials, which commanded respect, and [I was] impelled to . . . turn it to the advantage of the kind of education which such a country and such conditions needed.<sup>15</sup>

He found almost immediately, however, opposition to the Santa Fe Academy's religious sources of support, and charges of "sectarianism" were brought against his administration of the school. While the Academy had been chartered as "undenominational," Ladd and certain of the trustees disagreed over the meaning of the word, the trustees interpreting it as "unsectarian." Ladd commented in his diary, "They mean by the word non-religious, instead of the true sense. In a Trustees' meeting I argued the matter of the Christian support, Christian purpose, and Christian conduct of the school from the provisions of its fundamental law, and the facts of its support by the Christian churches and individuals of the East and West."<sup>16</sup>

The differences between Ladd and the trustees, with Mr. Ritch apparently being his chief opponent among the latter (Ladd called him "The greatest enemy and opposer to my work in Santa Fe"<sup>17</sup>), were a major subject of discussion between a committee of New West Commission representatives and the trustees in November, 1880.<sup>18</sup>

Mrs. Ladd's comments about the origins of Ritch's enmity are interesting. She described the Secretary of the Territory of New Mexico as

. . . a very handsome man, tall, imposing in build, a very vain, conceited, imperious, obstinate man. He had tried to rule all men and intended to be at the head and in the front of every matter of public importance in Santa Fe. He had succeeded in controlling affairs very largely. He was a Methodist before he went to S[anta] F[e] but as there was no church of this denomination there and, as he confessed later to a Methodist minister, he found his social position would be elevated by becoming an Episcopalian, he hid from everyone his earlier preference and became with his family a zealous Churchman and I presume there are few in S. F. now who have an idea that he was not born in the Church. This man accosted your papa the first or second evening as he was sitting at a table with his wife and asked papa to take a glass of beer with them. Papa politely declined the beer but sat with them for a chat. Mr. [Ritch] urged his taking some beer. This you will remember was at a fair gotten up for the benefit of [the] Academy under the fostering care of the Christian Educational Society. Papa replied that he did not drink liquors, and Mr. [Ritch] was piqued and determined this man should do so. "Now Mr. Ladd," he said, "if you wish to make yourself popular here you must do as the rest do—you must drink."

Papa declined, saying that popularity purchased at the expense of his principles would be worth very little to him. This he repeated to me

that evening when he returned, and I then predicted that [Mr. Ritch] would forever be his enemy, but Papa who "thinketh no evil" of men till he is forced by them to do so, laughed at my fears and assured me that he was on the pleasantest terms with Mr. [Ritch]. You can judge for yourselves whether it is not probable that Mr. [Ritch] never forgave papa for having his own way.<sup>19</sup>

Matters were further complicated by disagreement between Ladd and the trustees over the disciplining of a student, together with continued divergence of aim in the operation of the Academy as a church-sponsored school. As a result, Professor Ladd left the Academy in the Spring of 1881, and began the *Santa Fe Institute*, a rival school, in his home; with him he took a majority of the Academy's pupils as well as the support of the New West Commission.<sup>20</sup>

A New West committee had already recommended as a result of a survey in 1880 that that body leave Santa Fe, on the grounds that the American Home Missionary Society (an interdenominational organization) was already in the field, and it suggested that the Society take over its work.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, it continued to finance Ladd as before; but in August of 1881, as a result of an investigation and unfavorable report by Professor G. B. Wilcox, the Commission again switched its backing to the Academy.<sup>22</sup> This arrangement did not continue for very long, as a letter from Bliss to Ritch dated June 23, 1882 indicated that the Commission would not continue to support the Academy unless Ladd would give up the idea of a separate school. No agreement being reached, Ritch noted in a marginal gloss, "Terms were then made with Presbyterians."<sup>23</sup>

Meanwhile, Ladd was able to organize support outside the Board of Trustees of the Santa Fe Academy for the projected university, and on May 15, 1881 the University of New Mexico (at Santa Fe) was formally incorporated.<sup>24</sup> Commenting on this as "strangely brought about," Ladd wrote in his diary that day, "[God] has confounded my enemies before me. They were determined to thrust me out of the Academy because of my religious stand and influence; they were determined to obliterate the religious influence of educational institutions."<sup>25</sup> On May 19th the new trustees, at their first meeting, agreed on the religious provisions and basis of the University, restricting the officers and professors to "Protestant Evangelical Christianity."<sup>26</sup>

The Santa Fe Institute then became part of the University, then in actuality merely a grammar school. The name represented future plans rather than present reality, for it was decided to add higher educational courses only as the existing student body progressed to that point. The New West Commission refused further support then, because it disapproved of efforts to establish a university where



only elementary pupils were in attendance,<sup>27</sup> and by the fall of 1882 had abandoned the Santa Fe field entirely.

While the University was still in its formative stages, Ladd made frequent visits to the Pueblo Indian tribes, and read travelers' accounts, United States government reports, and early Texas Rangers' accounts of these New Mexican natives. His concern for them was reflected, subsequent to leaving the Territory, in a book entitled *Chunda: A Story of the Redemption of the Navajoes*, as well as numerous articles in the *Daily New Mexican*, *Ramona Days*, and eastern religious weeklies.<sup>28</sup>

The most important result of this interest was the opening of the Indian Industrial School of Santa Fe in 1885 as a division of the University. Ladd was particularly concerned about the education of the Indian children as part of his over-all purpose of Americanizing the Territory through denominational schools. The Roman Catholic missions had, of course, maintained classes for the Indians for several hundred years, but these had advanced little, even under the supervision of Archbishop Jean B. Lamy. "But what progress could be made in these Franciscan schools by these unlettered savages," asked Ladd,

when for writing paper they had only their sheep skins stretched on frames, ruled with pointed lead bullets and written with charcoal water thickened and fixed with saliva and held in a scooped out deer's horn fastened to a plank[?] Their pens were turkey or eagle feather quills. Catachisms [*sic*] were their reading books and the "Arte de bien morir" — "The art of Dying well" — was their spelling book. The modern Government and denominational Schools in Santa Fe, Albuquerque, and the pueblos for these people will in a few years show a vast improvement in their intellectual condition or their . . . usefulness for civilization. . . .<sup>29</sup>

Ladd succeeded in interesting several citizens of Santa Fe in donating land and a building for an Indian school. After obtaining an annual grant of \$3,000 from the American Missionary Association, he contracted with the Indian Bureau in Washington for the education of approximately fifty pupils at \$120 apiece. He also received a Congressional appropriation of \$25,000 for the school [HR 7356, SR 51, 48th Congress, 1st Session], \$25,000 by subscription, and the gift of one hundred acres of land.<sup>30</sup>

Acknowledging the fact that the University was a private, nominally non-denominational institution, Ladd felt nevertheless that the Indian boys and girls should receive religious training "in the general principles of piety and the love of God and his Commandments rather than in sectarian principles of worship or belief."<sup>31</sup> Ladd believed that only by including an education in the religious tenets usually associated with the United States of America could the Indians survive the "progress of the American people towards higher conditions of life and power,"<sup>32</sup> that is, the influx of "Anglos" into New Mexico.

Probably the most important convert to his cause was President Grover Cleveland, who wrote Ladd with regard to the Indian school, "Indeed I have arrived at the conclusion that Christianity and Secular education, are the surest, if not the only, avenue to reach the end we all so much desire—the civilization and the citizenship of the Indian. And the female children are certainly exceedingly promising objects of such education."<sup>33</sup>

Ladd met opposition from the Roman Catholic Church, for all of the Pueblo pupils who were actually or nominally Roman Catholic in religion were removed from the school after a year and a half. This left Ladd with fifteen Apache girls, who became the nucleus of the Ramona School (named in honor of Helen Hunt Jackson).<sup>34</sup> The Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington gave the University permission to draw pupils from the various Apache agencies (who had not previously been proselytized by the Franciscan missionaries) for both the boys' industrial school and the girls' Ramona School; and the institutions began to flourish within the limitations of space and funds.<sup>35</sup> Stanford White, the famous architect, submitted sketches for a new building for the Ramona School in 1886, but plans for this expansion never materialized.<sup>36</sup>

The University of New Mexico at Santa Fe, after an auspicious start in a new building, Whitin Hall, construction of which was begun in the fall of 1882,<sup>37</sup> never fulfilled its founder's high hopes. Following several years' precarious existence, the University was closed in 1888, and the enterprise was taken over by the Congregational Church as Whitin Hall School.<sup>38</sup> The Indian classes passed to the control of the Federal Government.

Nor had these been Ladd's only setbacks. During his later years as President and Financial Agent for the University, he engaged in buying and selling on a commission basis. These activities were brought to the attention of his fellow clergy in the Congregational Church. Thereupon they "withdrew from fellowship" with him in 1888, and both Ladd and the University were left without their formal support.<sup>39</sup> Ladd was subsequently confirmed—by the Missionary Bishop of New Mexico as an Episcopalian, and by the United States Senate as Census Superintendent for New Mexico. He served in this latter capacity during 1889 and 1890, when he left the Territory for the East. After further study he entered the priesthood of the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1891, and he served parishes in the New York area until his retirement in 1910. As rector-emeritus of Grace Church, Jamaica, Long Island, he died in 1932.<sup>40</sup>

The theme of education for American citizenship was one which Ladd continued to emphasize during his entire stay in New Mexico,

and one which, in those decades of social consciousness on the part of the churches, received widespread attention. His writings reflect his own increasing interest in this, and he constantly reiterated, "Popular superstition and ignorance must be removed if we would have good citizenship."<sup>41</sup> Not only did he point up the need for Americanization in his letters and requests for funds, but the issue is raised in the books which he wrote during his years in Santa Fe. In his *Fighting in Mexico*, a history of the Mexican War, he envisioned a great future for the entire Spanish Southwest, but warned,

Unless the hundreds of millions of people who shall yet occupy this belt of territories shall become like the citizens of the Eastern States in education, religion, laws, and customs of society, there will be a fissure in the Union along the borders of the great plains.<sup>42</sup>

He stated the case for the Protestant American denominations even more succinctly in an appeal for funds for the University:

To improve the conditions of the native population, we must bring them into contact with our institutions and business enterprises, through which they have already shown an awakened ambition and considerable progress towards the high civilization of American citizens elsewhere. . . . The increasing American and foreign population which now numbers about one-third of the inhabitants of the territory, needs the influence of such institutions as have moulded and stamped the character of New England and the Interior States. The peculiar constitution of society in this frontier territory requires for its reform not a merely secular education, but that which is distinctively, earnestly, and unwaveringly Christian.<sup>43</sup>

In this attitude he reflected not only his own convictions, but those of the New West Education Commission and others connected with it.<sup>44</sup>

All of the Protestant groups considered the Roman Church their greatest obstacle in the establishment of denominational schools.<sup>45</sup> Although Ladd avoided betraying his bias when discussing the Santa Fe Academy, the University of New Mexico, or the later established Ramona School in *The Story of New Mexico*,<sup>46</sup> he did comment on the illiteracy of the territory in the following manner:

It has been profitable to a few persons to keep the light of American civilization from penetrating the barrier of dense ignorance. . . . A few good denominational schools, and the example of American youth coming from these schools to take a forward place in business and in society had a good effect.<sup>47</sup>

His letters are more outspoken, however. In writing the directors of the American College Aid Society in 1884, he stated,

We are on a basis of free education and have been contending with Roman Catholics who control legislation & public school funds for the establishment of decent & efficient common schools in the Territory.

We are emphatically doing missionary work among people as superstitious as in Old Spain, and as heathenish as in Africa; but we are at work for the *citizens of our own country*. [Italics his.]<sup>48</sup>

In his report concerning the progress of the Santa Fe Academy during his administration there, Ladd wrote,

I ought to add that the Roman Catholic priests have publicly instructed and commanded their people in their churches the past month not to send their children to the Santa Fe Academy or the Presbyterian Mission School. The school board [is] composed of the Priest & R. Catholics and have requested the teachers of the latter to receive no Mexican or Catholic children into their school, or in any way care for or influence them.<sup>49</sup>

Ladd and others considered the work of the Roman Church more insidious than this. Reflecting the widespread Protestant belief that the Church in New Mexico represented a local manifestation of a "Romish plot" to take over the United States, Ladd wrote of conditions in the Territory as he saw them:

With legislation under [Roman Catholic] control, they are sure of territorial support and the favor of the majority of the population. New Mexico, if admitted now to the Union as a State, would be a unique member. The spirit and tendencies and incongruity of priestly supremacy with Republican institutions and government would be at once fully illustrated. We could thus try Papal dominion, not in one corner but almost in the center of the Republic, and determine quickly what are its perils to our liberties.<sup>50</sup>

Reiterating his belief that the 77½ million acres of New Mexican land was destined to maintain a population of millions, Ladd called for patriotic support of "private and Christian educational enterprise" by "those who regard this portion of the New West with just apprehensions of danger to our Union."<sup>51</sup>

Shortly after Ladd's arrival in Santa Fe, his friend Charles H. Howard, editor of *The [Chicago] Advance*, visited him and wrote,

If you still fear the old Spanish-Mexican lethargy is liable to come back, put your ear to the ground and listen to the railroad trains trundling into the Territory from so many different directions, hear the grinding and thumping of the quartz mills, and behold, in imagination, the inflocking of American miners, American merchants, American life, activity and enterprise of every form.<sup>52</sup>

Despite the apparent material failure of Ladd's enterprises, he was a significant representative of this "inflocking," and he was a major initiator of a movement which was to have lasting effects in New Mexico. Following the lead in the secular field of such relatively famous reformers as Edward F. Beale, the Indian agent, and Helen Hunt Jackson of "Ramona" fame, Ladd was a pioneer in New Mexican Indian education. He had won many citizens of the Territory to that cause, and he noted in his diary, "I have grateful remembrance here that some of these names [of donors to the Indian Industrial School] represent nearly all those who once were opposed to the establishment and progress of the University."<sup>53</sup>

His University of New Mexico, although doomed as a church-sponsored institution, made clear the need for such a school in the Territory; and the University of New Mexico, at Albuquerque, was officially chartered as a territorial college the next year, 1889. He had met continued opposition, it is true, particularly from the influential Secretary and Acting Governor of the Territory, William Ritch, who termed Ladd's administration of the Santa Fe Academy "unfortunate management . . . to state it mildly . . ."<sup>54</sup>

If there had been a lack of interest in the United States among the populace of New Mexico prior to Ladd's arrival, he hastened the "Americanization" process in no small degree. The programs of public performances by the students of the Academy and the University list what would, for the mid-twentieth century American, be an almost nauseating series of patriotic songs, poems, recitations (with gestures), and tableaux.<sup>55</sup> One can only speculate on the influence which this emphasis had on the Roman Catholic institutions in the Territory. It is interesting to note, however, that a contemporary program of the Sisters of Loreto Academy at Las Vegas included renditions of the "Star Spangled Banner" and "Hail, Columbia;" and tableaux entitled "Our Republic," "Faith, Hope, and Charity," and "The May Queen and Her Subjects."<sup>56</sup> These latter tended to be perennial in American public schools, at least up to very recent times.

Ladd's books directed national attention toward New Mexico. *The Story of New Mexico* was published in "The Story of the States" Series, edited by Elbridge S. Brooks, in 1891. A review in the *Nation* called the work "a gratifying step in the direction of fairness in history and independent judgment, unaffected by the stereotyped clamor against Spain in the New World."<sup>57</sup> His volume, *Chunda*, attracted sympathy and understanding for the Navajo people, as did his newspaper articles.

The judgment of E. Lyman Hood, in his history of the New West Education Commission, that "Prof. H. O. Ladd, though he made some mistakes, had no little influence in promoting the cause of education,"<sup>58</sup> seems to have been sustained by history. Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Charles J. Rhoads, wrote years later concerning Ladd, "We would not be even where we are today if so many splendid unrecognized men and women had not given their lives to the cause. Unfortunately, so many died brokenhearted and not realizing how much they were doing for the future."<sup>59</sup>

Perhaps, by the standards of those who reckon accomplishment in terms of "souls saved" or "pupils graduated," Professor Ladd was not a success. On the other hand, he exemplified more than most people the courage and energy which were needed to bring about the



Americanization of New Mexico. In 1890 there were only eight denominational schools left in the Territory; but the public school system was now accommodating fifty-one out of every hundred school-age children, as against four twenty short years before.<sup>60</sup> This did not mean that denominational schools had failed; far from it. On the nineteenth century national scene the churches had taken the lead in education, in social betterment, in labor relations, and in Americanization, until public opinion decreed that these were so important that they should be taken over as permanent functions of a tax-supported government.

So too in New Mexico, for Ladd had helped bridge the gap between no schools and a public school system for both Indians and whites. Imperfect though it may have been at the time, education in this portion of the Southwest might well have been retarded, and integration into the United States delayed, had it not been for Ladd's "New England Conscience."

1. *Barbarism, the First Danger: A Discourse for Home Missions* (New York: Printed for the American Home Missionary Society, 1847), 27, quoted in, Ralph Henry Gabriel, "Evangelical Religion and Popular Romanticism in Early Nineteenth Century America," *Church History*, XIX (March, 1950), 40.
2. (Boston: Frank Wood, 1879), 16. The idea, of course, is by no means new. See for example, Lyman Beecher, *Plea for the West* (2nd ed., Cincinnati: Truman & Smith; New York: Leavitt, Lord & Co., 1835), *passim*.
3. "11,520 Whacks and 43,897 Jolts," *The Congregationalist*, August 14, 1878, in *Scrapbook VIII*, 28, *Ritch Collection*, Huntington Library, San Marino.
4. Timothy Dwight, *Yale College: Some Thoughts Respecting its Future*.... (New Haven: Tuttle, Morehouse, and Taylor, 1871), 109. This book is a collection of articles which were printed in the *New Englander* in 1870-1871 under the title, "The True Ideal of an American University." These received wide attention at the time.
5. 119,565 in 1880. United States, Department of the Interior, Census Office, *Compendium of the Tenth Census (June 1, 1880)*... (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1883), I, 434, Table XXV.
6. *Idem*, *Compendium of the Eleventh Census: 1890* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894), Pt. II, 298-299, Table 6.
7. Letter from Lucien Birdseye to Horatio O. Ladd, May 28, 1883, "Commendations," *Ladd Papers*, Coronado Library, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
8. United States, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, *Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1881* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1883), 300. Cf. letter, Ladd to American College Aid Society, Oct. 6, 1884, *Ladd Papers*.
9. *Idem*, *Report of the Commissioner... 1890-91* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893), II, 1328, Table 7.
10. E[dward] P[ayson] Tenney, *The New West, as related to The Christian College and the Home Missionary* (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1878), 3rd Ed., 20.
11. United States, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, *Report of the Commissioner... 1872* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1874), 376.
12. Santa Fe *New Mexican*, July 27, 1878, *Scrapbook II*, 151, *Ritch Collection*.
13. "Letter from Santa Fe," dated in Ladd's handwriting "Sept. or Oct. 1879 [sic]," [*Christian Union*?], *Ladd Papers*.
14. Ladd, *Diary*, 3, unpublished MSS., *Ladd Papers*. (Hereinafter referred to as *Diary*.)
15. "Extracts from Autobiography & Diary of Dr. Horatio O. Ladd relating to his work in New Mexico," unnumbered leaves 5-6, unpublished TSS., *Ladd Papers*. (Hereinafter referred to as "Autobiography".)

16. *Diary*, 4.
17. *Ibid.*, 33.
18. Ritch notes the stay of the Congregational representatives at his home November 20-26, 1880; Ladd is not mentioned. Ritch, *Memoranda*, III, 358, *Ritch Collection*.
19. Mrs. Horatio Oliver Ladd [née Harriett Vaughn Abbott], "History of the University of New Mexico for our Children, Commenced in the fall of 1884 and written at intervals through the winter of 1885 and unfinished," unpublished TSS., unnumbered leaves 10-11. *Ladd Papers*.
20. *Diary*, 7-9. Commenting on this, the Ritch-controlled Santa Fe Academy's Report stated, "Of the third school year, 1880-1881, it is sufficient to say, that on account of the gross mismanagement and consequent unpopularity of the successor of Mr. Strieby [Ladd], it was quite unsatisfactory, resulting, before the close of the school in the demand for, and the starting of a rival school, which drew largely from the several departments of the Academy, leaving a mere nominal attendance." *Report of the Fourth Year of Santa Fe Academy... 1881-1882* ([Santa Fe]: *New Mexican*, [1882]), 3, Scrapbook VIII, 251 ff., *Ritch Collection*.
21. *Christian Advance*, Dec. 16, 1880, Scrapbook VIII, no page, *Ritch Collection*.
22. Letter, Ladd to William M. Berger, Santa Fe, Aug. 11, 1881, *Ladd Papers*.
23. Scrapbook VIII, unnumbered insert facing 265, *Ritch Collection*. Ladd writes a detailed commentary on the summer's negotiations in *Diary*, 34-36.
24. For an interesting account of this event and the circumstances surrounding the Ladd family at this time, see Frank D. Reeve, "The Old University of New Mexico at Santa Fe," *New Mexico Historical Review*, VIII (July, 1933), 201-210.
25. *Diary*, 7.
26. *Ibid.*, 9.
27. E. Lyman Hood, *The New West Education Commission 1880-1893* (Jacksonville, Fla.: H. & W. B. Drew Co., 1905), 78. Cf. *Diary*, 35.
28. "Autobiography," 8.
29. Ladd, [6] of 8 unnumbered leaves, unpublished MSS., n. d., *Ladd Papers*.
30. "Autobiography," 12-15; *Diary*, 67, ff.
31. Ladd, memorandum to Senator Blair for use in appropriation hearing, May 9, 1884, 2, *Ladd Papers*.
32. *Ibid.*, 4.
33. Letter, President Grover Cleveland to Ladd, Dec. 9, 1886, *Ladd Papers*.
34. Pamphlet, "The University of New Mexico," [Ladd, 1887]; Cf. Ladd, "Educational Work in Santa Fe, as connected with the University of New Mexico," unpublished TSS. [1885?], 6, *Ladd Papers*.
35. Ladd, [6] of 7 unnumbered MS. leaves, dated May 15, 1925, *Ladd Papers*.
36. Photographs and drawings, *Ladd Papers*.
37. University of New Mexico [Santa Fe], *An Account of the Exercises at the Laying of the Corner-stone of Whiting Hall, October 21, 1882* . . . ([Santa Fe]: Published by the University, 1883), *passim*.
38. In 1890-1891 this academy had 220 elementary and 13 secondary school pupils. *Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1890-91*, *op. cit.*, II, 1328, Table 7.
39. "Autobiography," 16-18. An undated copy of a letter of recommendation written by the prominent editor and churchman, Lyman Abbott, presumably at the time of Ladd's admission as a postulant in the Episcopal Church, absolves Ladd of any blame in this episode. Abbott was a first cousin of Mrs. Ladd.
40. "Autobiography," 24-25, ff.
41. Request for funds, University of New Mexico, unsigned, dated December 20, 1881, *Ladd Papers*.
42. Ladd, *Fighting in Mexico* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., [c. 1883]), 322.
43. Undated request for funds, University of New Mexico, signed by Ladd [1883?], *Ladd Papers*.
44. See N. W. E. C. broadside, November, 1880, Scrapbook VIII, 219-221, *Ritch Collection*.
45. For discussion, see, William Warren Sweet, *Religion in the Development of American Culture, 1765-1840* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), 171-172; and, Ray A. Billington, "Anti-Catholic Propaganda and the Home Missionary Movement, 1800-1860," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXII (December, 1935), 361-384 [incorrectly cited in Sweet]. Although these deal with an earlier period, the entire process was recapitulated in New Mexico in the latter nineteenth century.
46. Ladd, *The Story of New Mexico*, in Elbridge S. Brooks, ed., "The Story of the States" Series (Boston: D. Lothrop Co., [c. 1891]), 419.
47. *Ibid.*, 423.
48. Letter, Ladd to Directors of the American College Aid Society, Boston, October 8, 1884. "Essays, notes, etc.," *Ladd Papers*.
49. MS. dated Santa Fe, Dec. 1881 [1880?], "Report of Ladd of work at Santa Fe Academy for month of Nov. 1881 [sic?]", *Ladd Papers*.

50. Ladd, "Educational Work in Santa Fe...," *supra cit.*, 3.
51. University of New Mexico, *An Account of the Exercises... op. cit.*, 11; cf. pamphlet, "Present Conditions and Needs of the University of New Mexico," dated Jan. 1, 1884, 3, *Ladd Papers*.
52. "Editorial Correspondence," signed "C. H. H.," *The Advance*, Feb. 16, 1882, *Ladd Papers* and *Ritch Collection*.
53. *Diary*, 74.
54. Article dated March 21, 1882 in *Denver Inter Ocean*, April 1, 1882, signed by Ritch and others; for further evidence of Ritch's attitude toward Ladd, see marginal gloss of Ladd's account of U. N. M. progress in *New Mexican* article dated April 8, 1882 in Scrapbook VIII, 240-241, *Ritch Collection*. In addition to questioning the veracity of several statements, Ritch comments, "Bosh!... Balderdash!"
55. *Ladd Papers, passim; Diary*, 32.
56. *Revista Católica*, IX (June 30, 1883), 301.
57. Anonymous review of *The Story of New Mexico*, *Nation*, LIV (March 24, 1892), 237.
58. Hood, *op. cit.*, 79.
59. Letter, Charles J. Rhoads, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, U. S. Department of the Interior, to Ada Knowlton Chew, March 22, 1932, *Ladd Papers*.
60. *Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1890-91, op. cit.*, II, 1327-1328, Table 7.

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHURCH FATHERS<sup>1</sup>

BY HARRY AUSTRYN WOLFSON: A REVIEW ARTICLE

BY GEORGE HUNTSTON WILLIAMS, *Harvard Divinity School*

Harry Austryn Wolfson declared in an earlier volume that it was the purpose of Philo "not to teach true philosophy to students of Scripture, but to show the truth of Scripture to students of philosophy." Wolfson, in his comprehensive series of which the present study is an integral part, likewise seeks to show, if not the truth, at least the comprehensiveness, of "scriptural philosophy" to contemporary students of philosophy. He also shows the students of Scripture the extent to which true philosophy, i.e. Greek philosophy, has been reworked in the form of Christian theology. With this dual motivation he has analyzed and ordered the whole of patristic thought as an epoch in the intellectual history of mankind. A student and former colleague of George Foot Moore, member of the Semitics and the philosophy departments and the faculty of divinity in Harvard University, the Nathan Littauer Professor of Hebrew Literature and Philosophy views patristic philosophy synoptically as a major phase in what he calls "medieval" or "intermediate" philosophy; that is, the philosophy between ancient and modern times.

In preceding volumes he defined this era as extending from Philo to Spinoza and helped us glimpse its very essential unity. To Philo, who first attempted the task of harmonizing Scripture and reason and who thereby ushered in the era of "medieval" philosophy, Wolfson devoted two volumes (1947), subtitled "Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam." To Spinoza, who, in the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, systematically assaulted the vast edifice of the seventeen intervening centuries of philosophical construction, Wolfson had earlier de-

voted two volumes (1934), subtitled "Unfolding the Latent Processes of His Reasoning." Now he presents the first of another pair of volumes, devoted this time not to a single thinker but to a whole age and world of thought from Paul to Augustine in the West and to John of Damascus in the East. As in his treatment of Philo and Spinoza, so here in his treatment of the mind of an age and of a whole believing community, Wolfson not only traces the external formulations of religious philosophy, but also fascinatingly unfolds the latent or submerged processes of argumentation and recovers or refurbishes the time-rusted links in the reasoning whereby the philosophical legacy of Greece was reworked in the light of scriptural convictions. He calls the method "hypothetico-deductive."

The seventeen-century development between Philo and Spinoza, of which the philosophy of the Church Fathers is but a phase, is set off from ancient pagan Greek philosophy in the acceptance of Scripture or revelation as a source of wisdom different from, and superior to, reason. Wolfson has pointed out how even some of the ancients had come to regard encyclical studies as the handmaiden of philosophy and how thereupon Philo made philosophy itself the handmaiden of Wisdom or the Law. In the seventeen centuries of "Philonic" or "scriptural" or "believing" philosophy, reason was systematically subordinated to divine revelation. Jews, Christians, and Moslems<sup>2</sup> started from the kindred premise of a revealed word in a sacred book. Philosophy was by definition the harmonization of revelation and reason. Hence we will not think of "The Philosophy" in the title of the present work in terms of ancient or modern

philosophy wherein revelation is unheeded, nor even in the specialized sense of medieval Christian scholastic philosophy which was pleased to be assigned a place subordinate to, though theoretically independent of, theology proper, but rather as religious philosophy which differs in no essential from what both Catholics and Protestants more commonly call systematic theology,<sup>8</sup> that is, the philosophical ordering and occasional supplementation of the truth of revelation and of the birthright convictions of the believing community.

Common to all three variants of scriptural or "medieval" philosophy was the concern to restate pagan Greek philosophical material in the light of revelation to the end that the wisdom discovered by reason might be shown to be consonant with the wisdom disclosed in scriptures. Accordingly, the most important adjustments were made in epistemology, by heeding the role of faith; in metaphysics, by insisting upon a deity free from necessity; in physics, by assuring a place for the interruption of natural law through providence, prayer, and miracle; and in ethics, by vindicating the role of both free will and grace.

Wolfson does not permit himself to go on to give judgment as to whether he regards the subordination of reason to faith as valid. It is sufficient for him to be utterly absorbed in the reconstruction of the massive and intricate system of the patristic edifice which, with mounting admiration for both the original builders and our literary archeologist, we see tower about us as we proceed.

Since the problem of reason and faith turns at once into the problem of interpreting scriptures, Wolfson, following roughly his pattern in *Philo*, opens with allegorism.

The canons or conventions for the non-literal interpretation were first devised as a way of glossing over the moral infelicities of the Homeric text and as a way of unlocking its deeper meaning consonant with the advance of pagan culture. In due

course, the scriptures of Judaism and Christianity similarly underwent progressive allegorization.

Wolfson shows how midrashic and Philonic non-literal hermeneutics were combined and in due course applied to the normative writings of Christianity itself, namely, the New Testament.

Above the literal meaning, Philo had distinguished the "physical" and "moral" levels of interpretation. For both of these he employed the word "allegory," but also other items, i.e., "parable," "enigma," "type," "mystery," etc. In addition to the philosophical meaning of the Bible, Philo was concerned with other aspects of the higher meaning of the text, including the predictive. It was Philo's conviction, however, that the allegorical unlocking of a sacred text was valid only for the Bible. Moreover, unlike pagan allegorizers, Philo did not permit the non-literal meaning to eclipse the literal meaning.

Wolfson distinguishes, in the midrash of the rabbis, in contrast to Philo's philosophical and exclusive theory of allegory, four kinds of non-literal interpretation, namely: the moral, the preëxistential, and the predictive, the latter divided into the historical and the eschatological. He shows how Paul, who had been well instructed in midrashic method, re-conceived familiar biblical texts in the light of his conversion. Since for him some of the eschatological texts had been fulfilled in Jesus, these he now interpreted "adventually", while he construed other texts which had been predictive in rabbinical midrash as "eschatological" (in reference to Jesus' second advent).

Another stage in the evolution of the non-literal approach to the sacred text was reached when Irenaeus and Tertullian, as the first, extended the non-philosophical midrash method to the New Testament. Thereupon Clement of Alexandria went a step further by also taking over Philo's philosophical allegory for the New Testament. (Unlike Philo, he was even willing to acknowledge the validity of the



allegorical method in application to selected pagan texts.) Clement, in effect, combined the philosophical hermeneutic principles of Philo and the Christianized midrashic method of Paul and other New Testament writers, distinguishing as a result three levels of non-literal interpretation of the Christian Bible, namely, the moral, the physical, and the theological. Wolfson observes that these three roughly correspond to the main subdivisions or levels of philosophy itself. Thereby Clement laid the basis for the patristic science of hermeneutics. To Origen, however, we are indebted for the more specific terms used for the various kinds of allegory. Wolfson solves the vexing question of Origen's scriptural method by showing that he sometimes worked with a three-fold and sometimes with a four-fold division of the senses of scripture. In the latter scheme, he divided the spiritual into two parts. But his preferred scheme was three-fold. Wolfson points out the ambiguous role of Proverbs 22:20 ("Write then for thyself . . .") in the patristic uncertainty as to whether there are, in fact, two or three senses of scripture. Clement's text (and the Vulgate) reads "doubly" whereas the Hebrew and Septuagintal texts read "triply". After noting that Chrysostom and others in the school of Antioch sought to distinguish between type and theory because of their distrust of allegory as allegedly denigrating or eliminating the literal sense, Wolfson simplifies the remainder of the account by showing how it has been largely a matter of reshuffling and standardizing Greek and Latin terms. He concludes with Jerome's systematization of the thinking of the Eastern Fathers and his legacy to the West of our Latin nomenclature, namely, the literal (or historical) the tropological (or moral), and the mystical (or spiritual) senses. Thus Wolfson finds a consensus among the orthodox Fathers in the middle ground between the denial of literalism and extreme literalism.

Passing from the patristic combi-

nation of midrashic and philosophical allegory in the rationalization of revelation, Wolfson takes up the more specific problem of all 'medieval' philosophy, namely, the relationship between faith and reason and the meaning of faith in the Bible. Wolfson shows that in the Greek philosophical legacy, because of the confluence of Aristotelian "faith" and Stoic "assent," the Fathers had at their disposal two divergent meanings of faith, namely, 1) immediate perception, that is, assent to undemonstrated knowledge, and 2) assent on demonstration. Accordingly, since faith is enjoined in scriptures, two patristic theories were possible: 1) that immediate faith alone is intended, and 2) that both immediate and demonstrable faith are recognized in the Bible. The former is called the single-faith theory and involves the acceptance on authority of scriptural teaching. Of the single-faith theory there are two variants. The one which Wolfson calls traditionalistic, represented by Tertullian, esteems simple faith *quia absurdum est*. Tertullian holds that philosophical demonstration diminishes the merit of faith, unless it be that he who has simple faith is merely using his previously acquired philosophy for apologetic or pedagogical purposes. The other single-faith theory which Wolfson calls rationalistic is represented by Origen. Though Origen, like Tertullian, does not find the demonstrated faith of the Christian intellectual in the Bible, he maintains that Christianity requires that assent should be based on demonstration and that demonstrable faith is superior in merit. The double-faith theory, represented by Clement of Alexandria and Augustine, holds that scriptural teaching may be accepted on authority or as rationally demonstrable. Clement calls the latter "gnosis" or "scientific faith" and makes it of merit equal to that of simple faith.

The rule of faith became the criterion for interpreting both scripture and philosophy. Wolfson finds in it both the distinctively Christian doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation,

the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Second Advent and six (as anticipated in *Philo*, I, 194 and 197) of what he earlier worked out as the eight "scriptural presuppositions" or "principles" of Philo, ranging from 1) the existence and 2) the unity of God, to 6) the revelation of the Law with the patristic adaptation of an authoritative tradition as a sort of unfolding of the Oral Law implied in the Old Testament.

In *Philo* Wolfson had shown a native Jewish origin of the belief in the existence of ideas, like man created in the image of God, the patterns of the Tabernacle and of the Law, and the Messiah. In fact, some ten (not including man) were held, in Talmudic literature, to have been preëxistent. Philo had thus been able to draw upon Jewish tradition and did not import something entirely new when he found a central place for Platonic ideas in his scriptural philosophy. The Fathers adopted from Philo the concept of the Logos as the incorporeal mind containing the totality of ideas. But whether they held that the Logos, either in agreement with Philo, existed from eternity within God, and then, prior to the creation of the world came to exist by the side of God, or in departure from Philo, existed from eternity by the side of God, in either case they differed from Philo in holding that the Logos is one with God as one simple and indivisible Godhead. Certain ideas are therefore contained in the one Godhead and have no independent existence as in Philo. The question of whether there are other ideas outside the Godhead consequently arose as an independent problem for the Fathers; and at a point later in his volume Wolfson shows that all the Fathers followed variously Aristotle, Albinus or Philo in the interpretation of the Platonic ideas.

More thematic for the book than the relationship of preëxistent ideas in general to the Logos is the relationship of the Logos-Son to God the Father and of the Logos to the preëxistent Messiah and to the Holy Spirit. In brief, Wolfson assembles

evidence for an original "trinity" of God, the preëxistent Messiah, and the born Messiah. He holds that the Spirit was a Pauline synonym for the preëxistent Messiah.

He maintains indeed that there is no evidence of the orthodox Trinity in Paul, Matthew, and the Apostolic Fathers (though there may be one in John), and that a true Trinity prior to the birth first appeared clearly with the Apologists as a result of their harmonization of the New Testament and their consequent differentiation of the Logos and the Holy Spirit.

In an elaborate reconstruction of the presumptively original trinitarian formula, Wolfson collects all the salutations and benedictions in the New Testament and arranges them in such a way as to show a logical progression in the confession of faith. He suggests two sources of the formulas, namely, the baptismal rite and the Jewish benedictions of the Temple and synagogue. The first Christians, being born Jews, will have been baptized solely in the name of Christ. Among the Gentiles who knew not the Lord of Israel baptism in the name of God and of Christ was a natural prolongation of the formula.

Over against the unipartite and bipartite formulas is the tripartite formula, i.e., in Matt. 28:19 and II Cor. 13:14. Since belief in the Spirit was not peculiarly Christian but yet had never been made an object of Jewish confession of faith, the problem arises why the Spirit assumed a coördinate rank with belief in God and in Jesus as the promised Messiah. After conjecturing that a transitional baptismal formula must have read: "I baptize you in the name of God and Jesus Christ, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," and suggesting that for the sake of symmetry the phrase "ye shall receive the gift" simply dropped out, Wolfson leads into a major chapter wherein he elaborates his point that for Paul the Spirit was an alternative term for the preëxistent Messiah or Wisdom or preëxistent Law in line with Jewish usage. It is by placing Pauline expressions con-

cerning the mystery of the hidden Christ in parallel with biblical and rabbinical descriptions of both the preëxistent Messiah and the preëxistent Law and Wisdom that Wolfson's thesis is substantiated. Thereupon he shows that sonship was primarily used by Paul as a description of the relationship of the preëxistent Christ, called by him directly Wisdom and indirectly Spirit, to God and only derivatively of the revealed or born Jesus the Christ. Wolfson gives a reason why Paul was emboldened to use the attribution also of divine sonship to Jesus, despite his having the form of a man, the form indeed of a servant. It was in order to proclaim 1) that "he was the revelation of the hidden preëxistent Messiah, called Wisdom, who is described in Scripture as 'the son of God'" and 2) that the Holy Spirit had "led" him. (Anyone who is truly "led" by the Holy Spirit is called the son of God). Wolfson points out that the divine declaration and reiteration of Psalm 2:7 ("Thou art my son") which the Synoptists push back to the baptism at Jordan, is, in Paul, connected with the miracle of the resurrection (Rom. 1:4). Wolfson, in conclusion, summarizes his view of the Pauline trinity by boldly conjecturing a Pauline prologue to a Pauline Gospel: "In the beginning was the Spirit... and the Spirit was made in the likeness of men."

The Pauline conception of the leading of Jesus by the Spirit did not necessarily imply an earthly birth without human paternity. But in Matthew and Luke it is otherwise; for in them the Holy Spirit, definitely identified with the preëxistent Christ, is made in the likeness of men by being the begetter of Jesus. Wolfson says that the birth of Jesus of the Holy Spirit in the two Synoptists is a Gentile version of Paul's view that the preëxistent Messiah was *made* manifest in a man, just as, for example, the preëxistent Law had been *made* manifest in the Law of Moses. (Wolfson points out that the begetting in the Messianic Psalm 2:7 rabbinically

applies to the new life of the Messiah after his suffering, and also that the oft-cited Philonic allusions to virginal birth apply only to the allegorical interpretation of the relevant texts.) But though the two Synoptists reflect a Gentile elaboration in their view of a Spiritual generation, they give no evidence of the orthodox Trinity. Before the (virgin) birth there were only God and the Spirit.

John, in this respect closer to Paul than to the two Synoptists, is vague as to how the Logos—at once the Pauline preëxistent Christ (and Wisdom), the Philonic Logos, and the Solomonian Wisdom—became flesh. Wolfson sees in the Johannine prologue an adaptation of Philo's three stages of the Logos: 1) its being from eternity as the thought of God, 2) its creation prior to the world as the instrument or plan in the creation of the world, and 3) its immanence in the world as the instrument of divine providence, even when not recognized as such by the children of darkness. Beginning with 1:32 John speaks of a (preëxistent) Spirit which, presumably as in Philo, is distinct from the Logos, and which is a prophetic spirit, discharging some of the functions of the preëxistent Law such as teaching all things (14:26) and guiding unto truth (16:13). Thus, though in John, presumably as in Philo, there is a preëxistent Trinity of God, the Logos, and the Spirit, there is no explicit statement to that effect. He is explicit only with regard to a post-natal Trinity.

Having distinguished three New Testament mundane trinities in which the first member is God and the third is Jesus Christ and the second member is either the hidden preëxistent Christ or the begetting Holy Spirit (Matthew and Luke), or the Pauline-Philonic Wisdom-Logos (John), Wolfson proceeds to trace the first major patristic effort at harmonization, that of the Apostolic Fathers (and one Apologist, Aristides). He shows how in the process the Logos and Holy Spirit were provisionally identified (in contrast to Philo and despite John's vagueness)

so that for the Apostolic Fathers (no less than for Paul, the two Synoptists, and possibly John), there was still no true Trinity before the birth, although in this First Harmonization, the supernatural or virginal birth of Jesus, derived from the Synoptists, became henceforth a fixed element in the doctrinal complex with abiding significance for the definitive trinitarian formulation.

In Wolfson's demonstration, Ignatius is the most important witness, for the bishop twice mentions the Logos (*Ad Magn.* viii, 2 and *Ad Smyrn. Salut.*). In the former place the Son is identified as the Logos: "...one God, who manifested himself through Jesus Christ His Son, who is the Logos." Wolfson argues that when elsewhere (e.g., *Ad Magn.* xiii, 1) it is the Son who is mentioned, the reference is to Jesus, and not to the pre-existent Wisdom or the Logos. In any event, the post-natal trinity of Ignatius is more commonly expressed as God the Father, the Holy Spirit, and Jesus or the Son.<sup>4</sup>

As an example of the same kind of trinitarian harmonization in another Apostolic Father, we may cite Wolfson's interpretation of I Clement, lviii, 2: "As God lives and as the Lord Jesus Christ lives and the Holy Spirit." Though Clement does not here or elsewhere happen to use *Logos*, "John was known to him"; and this trinitarian phrasing means God, the born and resurrected Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit as the pre-existent Christ (or Logos). This identification of the Holy Spirit and the Logos is found also in Tatian and survived even in Lactantius, who spoke of the pre-existent Christ as being both a Spirit and the Word, and who was for this reason charged by Jerome with identifying the Spirit sometimes with the Father and sometimes with the Son.

Justin Martyr opened a second phase of harmonization, that of the Apologists, when he elaborated a pre-natal Trinity clearly distinguishing the Logos and Holy Spirit and therewith undertook a conscious effort to in-

terpret the Johannine Logos in the light of the Philonic Logos and to re-harmonize Paul, Matthew-Luke, and John.

On the matter of the first of these two tasks, the Apologists and the succeeding Fathers had before their philosophical eyes the two pre-mundane stages and the immanent stage of the Philonic Logos. Among the Fathers besides Justin who found the Philonic stages useful in the course of the Monarchian controversy were Theophilus of Antioch, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria (before altering his view<sup>5</sup> under the influence of his pupil Origen), Tertullian, Novatian, Lactantius, and belatedly, the fourth-century Zeno of Verona. But already in Irenaeus, the Philonic two-stage theory of the ante-mundane Logos was seen, in the controversy with the Gnostics, insufficiently to safeguard the eternal subsistence of the generated Logos, i.e., the pre-existent Christ or Son of God. Therefore both Irenaeus and Origen eliminated the internal Logos and construed the uttered or generated Logos as existing from the beginning in a one-stage theory, which in due course came to prevail, although the two-stage view was never conciliarly condemned.

Wolfson goes on to point out that there is no theological logic which would explain the coincidence of the temporary prominence of the two-stage theory of the Logos and the emergence of a distinction between the Logos and the Spirit in the Apologists. Therefore, since both the two-stage theory of the Logos and the differentiation between Logos and Spirit are to be found in Philo, he would assign to Philo a major role in the Apologists' "recovery" of a pre-mundane Trinity; for in the patristic use of Philo as a commentary on the prologue of John and the rest of the New Testament, it was possible to identify Paul's pre-existent Christ with the Johannine Logos and, in a new harmonization of the New Testament, take the Holy Spirit of both Paul and John as a third pre-existent being, a reconception facilitated at once by Philonic usage



and the fact that, as Wolfson had been careful to point out in his earlier analysis, Paul did not explicitly equate the preëxistent Christ and the Spirit, just as John did not explicitly differentiate his Spirit and the Logos. Wolfson then goes on to show how in the Second Harmonization it was urgently necessary, in view of the new distinction between the Spirit and the preëxistent Christ-Logos, to reconcile the view of the two Synoptists that the Holy Spirit had *begotten* Jesus Christ, and the view of Paul and John that a preëxistent being had *become* man or *flesh*. Wolfson notes three solutions advanced by the Apologists and the later Fathers, namely: 1) that at the annunciation the term Holy Spirit is to be taken to mean the Logos (Justin Martyr, Theophilus), 2) that the supernatural birth was effected by the coöperation of the Logos and the Spirit (Irenaeus, Tertullian), and 3) that the incarnation was enacted by the whole Trinity (Augustine, after rejecting the possibility that as the Logos was the Son of God the Father, the man Jesus Christ was the Son of God the Holy Spirit).

Wolfson goes on to show the lingering traces in patristic literature, mostly prior to Augustine, of incomplete or contradictory reassignment and distribution of New Testament texts and attributes to the three Persons. Notably the functions of the Pauline Spirit (=preëxistent Christ) and the Solomonic Wisdom (=Spirit) became applicable to the Holy Spirit in the patristic reworking of the Second Harmonization with the consequence that the Spirit, too, could be considered not only as a preëxistent being but also as God or equal to God. Wolfson draws attention to the hesitancy with which Tertullian first mentioned the deity of the third Person: "For we . . . do indeed definitively declare that two beings are God, the Father and the Son, and, with the addition of the Holy Spirit, even three" (*Adv. Prax.* xiii), and then more confidently: "The Father is God, and Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God." Wolfson contends that this

assertion is actually an outcropping of an old pre-Harmonization tradition, the survival and revival of the essentially Pauline view in a new context. By the end of the Arian controversy, the full deity of the third Person could be confidently demonstrated by means of proof texts which were cogent because they had originally pertained to the Second Person as Spirit (=preëxistent Christ).

To summarize Wolfson's thesis, the Philonic trinity of God, a Logos in three stages, and a prophetic Spirit had become the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit of Old Catholicism, each presently to be defined as consubstantial because the first stage in the *generation* (as distinguished from the Philonic *creation*) of the Son (=Logos) had been eliminated in the asseveration of an eternal generation and hence of an eternal subsistence of the Son, and because the preëxistent prophetic Spirit of Philo had, now that Son was the technical term for the Second Person, come into possession of functions of the Pauline Spirit and of the Solomonic Wisdom, each of which had originally served as approximate equivalents of what the Fathers now meant by the eternal Son. At length, as in Augustine, everything which could be said of one Person might be said of the others; and, with the disappearance of any rigid distinction of function, the three Persons were, in compensation, distinguished among themselves in their relationship, in an extended process in which "ingenerate," "generation," and "procession" became the established technical terms.

With his completion of the hypothetico-deductive tracing of the latent processes of reasoning whereby the Old Catholic Fathers approached the Nicene solution of the problems, Wolfson turns to the three residual mysteries clarified preëminently in the period between Nicaea and Chalcedon, namely, the mystery of the eternal generation of the Son, the mystery of three Persons and their consubstantial Godhead, and the mystery of the manner of the incarnation. Although the arrangement of the complex material



is genetic and not chronological, and so stringently topical that the reader will have mastered the views of John of Damascus on consubstantiality before he has gone through Tertullian on the union of the two natures of Christ, the accent of Part Three is on the problems of the closing phase of the Arian controversy and on the extended permutations of christological debate to the end of the Monergistic and Monothelete controversies.

The mystery of eternal generation is recounted in terms of the difficulties attending the transition in Christianity from the old scriptural conception of God as artisan to the mythological conception of God as begetter and the persistent inadequacy of all efforts to supply analogies.

On the unity of the triune God, Wolfson analyzes the issues of the Monarchian controversy; and, after showing how the modalistic effort to dispose of the problem was rejected by the orthodox Fathers, he distinguishes two kinds of relative unity to which the Fathers appealed, namely, the unity of rule and the unity of substratum. In the second of these, the more philosophical effort, he shows how the Fathers employed three of the five kinds of relative unity analyzed by Aristotle, thus introducing among others the technical terms *ousia* and the equivocal *hypostasis* and the various ways of formulating the unity and diversity as between species and genus in respect to Person and the common Godhead. Wolfson traces the elaboration of the two approaches to the problem of the divine unity, first, in Origen with whom the continuity of philosophical language is clearest, then in Tertullian, Basil of Caesarea, John of Damascus, and Augustine.

In dealing with the mystery of the incarnation, Wolfson suggests that the problem of the Person of Christ became central again at that point in philosophical speculation when Jesus as the third member of the "original" post-natal trinity had so paled in the transmutations undergone in the First and Second Harmonization that the problem of his Person pressed for

clarification. Wolfson makes the third stage of the Philonic Logos, that of the Logos immanent in the world, the philosophical analogue of the incarnate Logos of Christianity. He points to a major source of the christological problem in the difference between the Pauline and the Johannine language respecting the incarnation. In Philipians the preëxistent was made *man*; in the Fourth Gospel, made *flesh* (or *body*). Since a body by definition lacked, if not an irrational *psyche*, at least a rational soul, the hypothesis of the indwelling of the Logos in an irrational body was a facile solution of the problem first articulated by Apollinaris. Before him, the Fathers were insufficiently aware of their problem, although they—in contrast to the Gnostics—assumed that Jesus was truly and fully man with a rational soul. But the opponents of Apollinaris' solution insisted, on the analogy of the body and soul of one personality, that Jesus Christ was made up of two elements, the Logos and a complete humanity, each component being referred to philosophically as a nature, *ousia*, form or quality of existence, etc., until the first term became fixed as the technical term of the orthodox.

For the Fathers the manner of the union of these two natures long remained a baffling problem. In a chapter, incomparable in the light it throws on the vexing question of the two natures, Wolfson painstakingly distinguishes five types of physical union amid the fluid and occasionally ambiguous nomenclature of two philosophical traditions (Aristotelian and Stoic). With the cunning of a physicist he constructs the five ideal types and, despite the shifts in the underlying philosophical terminology as well as the patristic adaptations, establishes the continuities by the analogies used and examples cited. He ascertains that it was the Aristotelian union of "pre-dominance" which the orthodox Fathers finally selected to explain the unity of person in Jesus compatible with the duality of natures in him. But even after explaining the union in philosophical terms, there remained the

mystery and uniqueness of a union of predominance in which the Logos always prevailed over a hence sinless humanity despite the free will of the manhood.<sup>6</sup>

Among the non-orthodox formulators of the physical union in Christ, Wolfson deals notably with Nestorius and Severus of Antioch.

Nestorius did not claim the union to be one of "predominance" but rather one of juxtaposition (composition) and not "by hypostasis" but "by good pleasure" (*eudokia*). There were not only two natures, but also two persons, as his condemners averred (though Nestorius never said this directly); and only as he thought of these two persons becoming one person at the incarnation could Nestorius formally agree with the Chalcedonian formula. Thus, despite the efforts of several modern scholars at rehabilitation, Wolfson learnedly casts Nestorius once again among the anathematized. His demonstration that Nestorius actually held to two persons as well as to two natures centers in the utterances of Nestorius as to the moment of the incarnation, the persistence of distinctive personal traits behind the new Person of the incarnate one, and the distinction drawn by Nestorius between the union of these two persons and the union of their natures, for which union he uses the term conjunction (*synapheia*).

Wolfson is undecided as to whether the spokesman of moderate Monophysitism, Severus of Antioch, using the term *nature* for *hypostasis* (person) in the tradition of Cyril of Alexandria, really differed from the Chalcedonians only in terminology and in strategic wariness about any verbal appeasement of the Nestorians, or whether Severus with his duality of "properties" effectually eliminated the equivalent of the Chalcedonian human nature in a union which, though defined as one of "predominance" like the orthodox, actually differed from it (as was surely the case of the union for Apollinaris and for the Eutychian Monophysitism of Theodoret of Cyrrhus).

Wolfson is illuminating as he moves

on to the duality of wills and operations. He shows how the problem was genetically connected with the problem of two natures. In his demonstration he vindicates the orthodoxy of Pope Honorius who was singled out by the Sixth Ecumenical Council for his alleged Monotheletism.

Wolfson separates his consideration of representative christological heretics from his consideration of the anathematized in general whom he reserves for treatment in Part Four because of his special theory of heresy. Wolfson holds that *catholic* Christianity (the Philonic equivalent designates the more universal polity of Jewry and its common faith as distinguished from local practices) was originally defined by the mutual accord of successive generations of leaders and the faithful, that it was able to extrude or prevent the entry of Gnosticism by consensus, but that with the emergence of councils, Catholicism, from being "consentaneous," became "statutory" with doctrine defined by majority vote.

Gnosticism, unlike all the other heresies, did not arise within Christianity. It arose outside of Christianity and was never admitted into it; for, carrying further the theory of W. Bousset and E. F. Scott, Wolfson holds, against Harnack, that far from being an "acute secularizing and Hellenizing of Christianity," Gnosticism was a congeries of religious syncretisms, some of which had been mounted with selected Christian tenets, notably the preëxistent Christ and his incarnation. Wolfson characterizes Gnosticism as a "verbal Christianizing of paganism." Although several of the Fathers themselves sought to disparage various Gnostic systems by tracing their alleged pedigree back to certain philosophies, Wolfson as philosopher, as Jew, and as historian of the philosophy of the Church Fathers, refuses to grant the Gnostic masters so distinguished a lineage and declares that by none of them was their medley of pretensions and pseudo-piety "harmonized with philosophy so thoroughly and so systematically as was Judaism by Philo and Christianity by the fol-

lowers of Philo among the Fathers of the Church." The piety of the Gnostics was pagan and their pretension lay in their claim, without appreciation of the Law or perception of the Gospel, to know those deep things which according to Hebrew Scripture (Job 11:8) are past finding out, which according to Paul (I Cor. 2:10) God through the Holy Spirit causes to be revealed to *all* believers and not merely to the allegedly superior, and which according to Plato constituted the reward of disciplined philosophers in contemplating the ideas (*Rep.* vi. 508 E). Wolfson shows that the true gnostic of Clement of Alexandria had better warrant in scripture for the term *gnosis* than those who called themselves Gnostics. In fact, scriptural philosophy is the valid Christian gnosticism.

Despite his philosopher's repugnance for the self-styled Gnostics, Wolfson analyzes their systems with the same painstaking care as the patristic material, perhaps more so for the reason that the fragmentary character of the Gnostic writings and the programmatic distortion of their ideas as refracted through the Fathers place Wolfson before the supreme test of his hypothetical deductive method; for he is here not merely reconstructing the latent processes of a system from its fragments but from tendentially reassembled fragments. It is almost as though a serious economic historian were called upon to reconstruct Marx's theory from McCarthy's diatribes against "Fifth Amendment Communists."

It is probable that Wolfson's unraveling of the monstrous webs of Gnosticism (which preserved even in distorted form certain theological and christological variations systematically expunged from the writings and liturgies of catholic Christianity) suggested to him some of the clues for his monumental genetic study in Parts I through III, even though he eschewed using Gnostic data directly in that reconstruction.

Wolfson's initial analysis is that of two representative and traditionally primitive exponents of Gnosticism,

Cerinthus and Simon Magus who, for Wolfson's purposes, need not to have been either primitive or even real leaders, since the systems attributed to them contain the two basic variations which Wolfson thereupon traces in the more elaborated and complex varieties of advanced Gnosticism. Wolfson had, it should be noted, completed his basic analysis of the Gnostic fragments before the plethora of newly discovered Gnostic material could be made available for incorporation. He has examined enough of it to be confident that when duly analyzed, it will but confirm his views.

Within the basic dualism of Gnostic syncretism, Cerinthus' system is marked by a divine *pleroma* in which, besides a supramundane being presumably identified with the God of the New Testament, there is, on a second tier, another divine being described in terms suggestive of its identification with the preëxistent Christ and taken to be the same as the Holy Spirit, and a third tier one of whose members or whose sole member is the creator of the world and presumably identified with the God of the Old Testament.

In the second archetype of Gnosticism, that of Simon, the second tier of the *pleroma* has *two* divine beings sexually coordinate, the masculine preëxistent Christ and the feminine Holy Spirit (the gender suggesting a Semitic rather than a Hellenistic origin of the distinction), while the third tier clearly has many supramundane beings.

Within the Cerinthian system Wolfson distinguishes a pre-Christian, though possibly partly judaized, stock from the Christian ingraftment which, among other things, converts the original plurality of deities into a number of preëxistent beings consonant with scriptural nomenclature. After exonerating Philo of the scholarly charge that his Creator-Logos might have been the source of the Cerinthian view of the supramundane creator of the world, Wolfson proceeds to identify Cerinthianism as akin to the Colossian heresy (Col. 2:8), holding that Cerinthus had misinterpreted Paul's

statement about the preëxistent Christ and Jesus "born of a woman," "in the likeness of men."

Correspondingly, Simon Magus is shown to have syncretized in a Johannine rather than a Pauline milieu with the result that he distinguished Logos and Holy Spirit.

As to the Christologies of the two archetypal forms of Gnosticism, Cerinthian Ebionism is a distortion of Pauline Christology, while Simonian Docetism is a distortion of Johannine Christology. Hence the vigorous repudiation of Docetism in I John 4:2 and II John 7.

Wolfson subsumes the remainder of the anathematized under two heads dealing with the relationship of 1) the preëxistent and 2) the born Christ, to God. Just as Catholicism in respect to the Trinity finds the truth, as Gregory of Nyssa said, between "the monotheism of the Jews and the polytheism of the Greeks," so in respect to Christology it has sought to define the truth between the mutually contradictory Ebionitic or Jewish view of Jesus as a prophet and adoptive Son and the docetic or pagan view of Jesus as a divine epiphany.

Among the heresies under the first heading Wolfson distinguishes schematically between "Creationism" and "Modalism." Creationism represented a revival of the Philonic view that the Logos and hence the Son is a creature. Arius was its chief exponent. Arianism was thus an acute re-Philonization of Christian theology. Modalism, in contrast, rejecting the Philonic *second* stage, held to a one-stage theory of the Logos-Son; but unlike the *orthodox* single-stage theories (Irenaeus and Origen), Modalism considered the Logos as the mind of God or the ideas in God without independent existence. Sabellius, of course, was its chief exponent.

Turning to the christological heresies, Wolfson makes use of his analysis of "Pauline"-Cerinthian Ebionism and "Johannine"-Simonian Docetism and, by combining these variously with the two preceding theological aberrations, finds not two but three basic

recurrent types of christological aberration from the Catholic norm, namely: modalistic neo-Docetism (Praxeas, Noëtus, Commodian), modalistic neo-Ebionism (Paul of Samosata), and creationist neo-Ebionism (Arius). Arius like Apollinaris held that the Logos took the place of the rational soul in a body with an irrational soul, but since Apollinaris held to a high view of the Logos and was hence orthodox in respect to the Trinity, the two heretics are not classed together at this point.<sup>7</sup>

Philosophers, theologians, and historians, Jewish, Catholic and Protestant, will be discussing the patristic problems in Wolfsonian categories for years to come and pursuing their research in an effort to confirm, refute, or revise his findings. Long before its publication, the work was anticipated as a major event in the history of patristic studies. But one is emboldened to go further now that the book is out and say that its publication is a major event in Church history.<sup>8</sup>

It was perhaps exactly 1800 years ago that the Apologist Justin Martyr, upon whose foundations so much of the philosophical and theological edifice of the later Church Fathers rested, wrote down his reminiscences of a dialogue with a Jew to whom he gave the name Trypho, perhaps to suggest to his Christian readers that the original debate had taken place with none other than the redoubtable Rabbi Tarphon.

Justin records the closing words of his irenic disputant, speaking for himself and his companions: "We have found more than we expected and more than it was thought possible to have expected; and if we could do this more frequently, we should be much helped in the searching of the scriptures themselves." Now in the fulness of time, a Jew more learned than Rabbi Tarphon and even more irenic than Trypho, has examined the main corpus of normative and heretical Christian writings and gladly acknowledges, as a philosopher, that he has found more than he expected when he laid down his pen on completing *Philo*. Under

his steady scrutiny one ancient heretic has been rehabilitated on one point; another, more recently vindicated by modern scholarship, has been re-consigned to the anathematized, while occasionally an orthodox Father has been shown to nod. Professor Wolfson has deeply honored the first fashioners of Christian theology by scrutinizing the classical texts and by painstakingly reconstructing the fragments of certain superseded systems with a care perhaps never accorded some of them before.

It may nevertheless be helpful to conclude this account in pointing out again that it is an incompletely acknowledged presupposition of all Wolfson's studies in the projected series from *Philo* through *The Fathers* to the Kalam and the Scholastics that, given an authoritative book of revealed truth and a generally recognized corpus of philosophical thought, there can be only a limited number of combinations and reconciliations of the scriptural and philosophical texts. Thus Wolfson has felt methodologically confident as he dispenses with the chronicle of councils and kings, caliphs and cadis, to concentrate wholly on the genealogy and fecundity of ideas which can indeed be shown to have a marvelous life of their own with an inner cunning, with affinities and antagonisms, quite apart from the fortunes of general history and even the community of faith itself. From this methodological purity derives the audacity of his achievement. Wolfson has undertaken his task as one sitting down to assemble the pieces of a vast transcription of truth. He has been

able to be indifferent to the temporal sequence of external history in fitting the pieces into place, now working at the upper, now near the lower reaches of his chronological frame; for he has been confident that enough of the strange shapes cut by the vagaries of party strife and the hazards of transmission can still be found to fill out the picture, and he has been ever mindful that there are many stray pieces which must be discriminatively piled to one side or the other as manifestly spurious or extraneous, belonging to other patterns. For Wolfson works with the presupposition of orthodoxy and heresy, though in the dispassionate sense of what has been philosophically fitting and what has been inept in the historic juxtaposition of scriptural and philosophical texts.

We can therefore derive the most from following Wolfson bowed over the patristic puzzle if we recognize with him at the outset that the image before us even when put together at the end is only a literary transcription of the Passion of a Man and the passions of men. For church history and *Heilsgeschichte*, the redemptive meaning of trinitarian and christological formulations are more than the unilinear progression of ideas, however carefully plotted. Professor Wolfson's philosophical reconstructions will be of immense help to the church historian and the historian of dogma in indicating the extent to which Greek philosophical categories do or do not account for the mystery and the movement behind the theological rationalizations of the ancient church.

1. *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, I; Faith, Trinity, Incarnation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. xxviii, 635.
2. We have a foretaste of Wolfson's projected unit on the persistence of pagan, philonic, and now also patristic philosophical motifs in Muslim philosophy in his recent "The Muslim Attributes and the Christian Trinity," *The Harvard Theological Review*, XLIX (1956), pp. 1-18.
3. To be sure, the present study does not take up all doctrines. For example, it

omits some of the heretical formulations connected with the Holy Spirit and the resurrection body of Christ; Macedonianism, Wolfson says discreetly, is philosophically only another form of the problem of Creationalism and Modalism, while the problem of the resurrection flesh is assimilable to the broader problem of resurrection to be treated in Volume II. A condensed form of Wolfson's interpretation of the patristic views of resurrection and immortality is presented in the Ingersoll Lecture of



1956. *Harvard Divinity School Bulletin*, No. 22.

4. In discussing with this reviewer this crucial link in his demonstration, Professor Wolfson drew from his overflowing files of material not incorporated in the book the following supplementation which could well be inserted in the argument on p. 184 at the end of line 19:

Corroborative evidence that Ignatius identified the Logos with the Holy Spirit is to be found in the fact that while in the passage quoted (*Ad Magn.*, viii, 2) he speaks of "Jesus Christ His Son, who is the Logos," in another passage he speaks of an "inseparable Spirit, which (*hos*) is Jesus Christ" (*ibid.*, v). Indirect evidence that "Son" in the trinitarian formula "in Son and Father and in Spirit" (*ibid.*, iii, 1) refers to the born Christ is to be found in the trinitarian formula implied in a passage in which Ignatius speaks of man's being hoisted up to "God the Father" by "the hoisting-machine of Jesus Christ, which is the cross" and by the use of "the

Holy Spirit as a rope" (*Ad Ephes.*, ix, 1).

In his interpretation of the masculine relative pronoun *hos* (*Ad Magn.*, xv) as referring to *pneuma*, Wolfson agrees with Harnack (*DG* I, 4, p. 214, n.1) over against Lightfoot. In the masculine use here, Ignatius follows Gal. 3:16.

5. On this Prof. Wolfson wrote in *Church History*, XX (1951), pp. 72-81.
6. Wolfson proposes to show in Volume II that free will was the basic patristic position as against the emphasis of Augustine.
7. In an important paper delivered at the Dumbarton Oaks Symposium (May, 1956) the anthropology and Christology of the two have been illuminatingly juxtaposed. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (Harvard University Press, 1957).
8. The reviewer has expressed more personal remarks on the historical significance of the book in an interfaith salute to Professor Wolfson on the occasion of his seventieth birthday and the completion of the galley. *Harvard Divinity School Bulletin*, No. 21 (1955-56), pp. 81-91. Professor Wolfson's reply is printed *ibid.*, pp. 94-100.

## SURVEY

### MEDIEVAL CHURCH HISTORY

RAY C. PETRY, *Duke University Divinity School*

It is appropriate to note at the outset the increasing usefulness, for the church historian, of *The Progress of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in the United States and Canada. Bulletin* No. 23, edited by S. Harrison Thomson (Boulder, Colorado, 1955), lists research projects (joint and individual), learned papers read, books just published and in press, dissertations completed and in progress, and full reports of ranking scholars and their productivity. The relation of research to effective undergraduate teaching is significantly noted by Professor Thomson in the *Bulletin*, pp. 17-21. Wise counsel, equally pertinent with the above, for the medieval church historian, concerns both graduate and undergraduate instruction as these are evaluated in the presidential address of Dexter Perkins before the American Historical Association ["We Shall Gladly Teach," *American Historical Review*, LXII, 2 (1957), 291-307]. The role of bibliography and critical reviews remains characteristically apparent in such organs as the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, *Speculum*, *Le Moyen Âge*, and the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*. Knitting the late patristic era and the early medieval field is P. U. Domínguez de Val, "Cuatro años de bibliografía sobre Patristica española (1951-1954)," *Revista Española De Teología*, XV, 3 (1955), 399-444. Materials on Isidore of Seville and his successors, the Mozarabic liturgy, and Hispanic collections of canon law are especially useful. Valuable studies from the Congrès international Augustinien, Paris, 21-24 Sept., 1954, are reported in three volumes of *Augustinus Magister* (Paris, 1955).

Effective work in the critical establishment and editing of texts, as

well as progress in the development of trustworthy translations, may be representatively noted. Fr. Sal. Schmitt is typically seen in "Die echten und unechten Stücke der Korrespondenz des hl. Anselm von Canterbury," *Revue Bénédictine*, LXV, 3-4 (1955), 218-228. J. Leclercq, "Recherches sur les 'Sermons sur les Cantiques' de Saint Bernard," *ibid.*, 228-258, is similarly rewarding. A satisfying editorial achievement is M. Maccarrone, *Lotharii Cardinalis (Innocent III): De miseria humane conditionis* (Lugano, Switzerland and Cambridge, Mass., 1955). The promise of the *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*, is being realized in such editions as those of *Bedae Venerabilis Opera* (Parts 3 & 4: *Opera Homiletica*, & *Opera Rhythmica*, no. cxxii, Turnhout, Belgium. Brepol, 1955), as well as in an edition of *De Civitate Dei* (nos. 47-48). A massive set of well edited, translated texts comprises the volumes, I and II (1955), by Dorothy Whitelock and D. C. Douglas (Ed.), in *English Historical Documents*. Included is a rich diversity of selections from histories, annals, laws, saints' lives, and other church historical treasures. Also illuminative for the English medieval scene are M. Chebna, ed., and tr., *The historia pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, London, 1956, and the *Letters of John of Salisbury*, Vol. I, Ed. by W. J. Millor and H. E. Butler, London, 1955, with Latin and English parallels. The last part of A. Saltman, *Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury*, London, 1956, is invaluable Latin text. E. Lewis, *Medieval Political Ideas*, 2 vols. (New York, 1954), is a most welcome selection of sources in English translation. Not to be overlooked is R. H. Bowers, "A Middle English Mnemonic Poem on Usury," *Mediaeval*

*Studies*, XVII (Toronto, 1955), 226-232. Significant reissues of Latin texts include H. Denifle u. F. Ehrle, *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, 5 vols. (Graz, 1956).

The inner spirit and the world view of the medieval man are provocatively related to the fundamental humanity of the Christian "common life" in a perceptive analysis of source literature and secondary critiques by Don G. Pesce, "Le moyen âge: Considérations sur le sens et le sort d'une époque historique," *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, XXVI, 1 (1956), 6-38. Seeking further to relate medieval man to history through the historical sense of other medieval men, M. D. Chenu writes on "Conscience de l'histoire et théologie au xii<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, XXI (1955), 107-133. The historical sense is exemplified from within the historic Roman hierarchy by the "Discorso Di Sua Santità Pio XII Al X Congresso Internazionale Di Scienze Storiche (7. Sett., 1955)," in *Rivista Di Storia Della Chiesa In Italia*, IX, 3 (1955), 321-330. The Congress is further reported by M. Maccarrone, pp. 436-442. Deeply indicative of the entire medieval *Weltanschauung* is B. Widmer, *Heilsordnung und Zeitgeschehen in der Mystik Hildegards von Bingen* (Basel u. Stuttgart, 1955).

Poignantly aware of the need to remind Christians—even those of long-standing Roman Catholic connections—of their stake in the resources of the Latin tongue, E. Gareau presents a sanely eloquent reply to the question, "Pourquoi tenir à l'enseignement du Latin?" *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, XXVI, 1 (1956), 39-55. Among the decided boons to students and directors of students in the area of medieval languages and literature are such works as A. Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* (Strasbourg, 1954), and his introduction to the larger work, *Manuel du Latin Chrétien* (Strasbourg, France, 1955). These and similar lexicographical aids are critically reviewed in *Recherches de Théologie anc. et*

*méd.*, XXII (1955), 133-135, and in *Rev. d'hist. eccl.* LI, 1 (1956), 192-196. Joachim Kirchner's delightful *Scriptura Latina Libraria a saeculo primo usque ad finem Medii Aevi* (Munich, 1955) is an invaluable collection of facsimilies, with 52 plates (77 photographs), fully described and beautifully edited, together with matching texts. The MSS are thoroughly oriented for the paleographer and the student of literature and writing alike.

Outstanding contributions to the interpretation of medieval thought, letters, education, and historical theology include B. Meller, *Studien zur Erkenntnislehre Peter von Ailly* (Freiburg, 1954). This is a careful, competent study with extraordinarily good bibliographies and, as a dividend in source editions, an appendix constituting the middle section of *De materia concilii generalis*. The first and third parts are already available in Du Pin's Gerson *Opera*, and in Van der Hardt, Finke, and other conciliar *Acta*. F. Van Steenberghen's *The Philosophical Movement in the Thirteenth Century* (New York, 1955), reports the author's significant departures from the generally accepted positions of other scholars, such as Gilson, on Aristotelian elements in medieval scholastics. The author summarizes his evaluation of Bonaventure's philosophy as "an eclectic and Neoplatonic Aristotelianism, subordinated to an Augustinian theology." This brief book is a provocative résumé of contemporary critiques on leading medieval thinkers and their university environments. A signal contribution to medieval educational theory and practice is the critical edition and translation, by D. D. McGarry, of *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury* (Berkeley, 1955). Valuable services are rendered by M. M. Lebreton, "Recherches sur les principaux thèmes théologiques traités dans les sermons du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Rech. de théol. anc. et méd.*, XXIII, 1-2 (1956), 5-18 and by P. Glorieux, "L'enseignement universitaire de Gerson," *Ibid.*, 88-113. In both, the principal themes of medie-

val thought, the soteriological preoccupations of the Church, and her sacraments are emphasized. The latter is especially helpful for the MS relation of Gersoniana to the mystical tractates, the Dionysian corpus, and the Du Pin Opera. A. Baron contributes, in the same journal, "L'influence de Hugues de Saint-Victor," XXII, 1-2 (1955), 56-71. E. H. Emerson, "Reginald Pecock, Christian Rationalist," *Speculum*, XXXI, 2 (1956), 235-242 provides a good case for the variously estimated Pecock as "an almost unique thinker," albeit mainly orthodox when examined regarding his views on "faith, reason, the Church, and Holy Scriptures." A. L. Gabriel, *Student Life in Ave Maria College, Mediaeval Paris* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1955), supplies the distinguished editing of the chartulary text, with superb plates of miniatures illustrating the statutes. These are given introductions and translations illuminating devotional life, library regulations, liturgical plays, and much more that is frequently ignored or seen out of context. In Crouzet's *Histoire générale des civilisations*, Ed. Perroy edits vol. III: *Le moyen âge* (Paris, 1955). The second part, on centuries 11-13, is especially helpful, with good, if overbrief bibliographies, a valuable "Tableau synchrone," a number of good plates, and an excellent index.

In the area of medieval spirituality and mysticism continued activity is reflected by the studies of P. Debonnie, "Petite chronique imitacioniste (1940-1956)," in *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, XXXII, 126 (1956), 215-224. Here the current researches of L. M. J. Delaissé, among others, and the posthumous publications of J. Huyban are documented. Quite valuable is M. Goossens, *De Meditate in de Eerste Tyd van de Moderne Devotie* (Antwerp n. d.) with its résumés of literature on Lowlands spirituality and the "New Devotion," plus an appended text of Fl. Radewijns' *Tractatus Devotus*.

Clear and succinct is the meticulous-ly documented study of D. Phillips,

"The Way to Religious Perfection According to St. Bonaventure's *De Triplici Via*," in J. H. Mundy, et al., *Essays in Mediaeval Life and Thought Presented in Honor of Austin Patterson Evans* (New York, 1955). In G. H. Tavad, *Transiency and Permanence* (St. Bonaventure, New York, 1954), Chapter 12, pp. 229-247, "Transitus," is particularly significant for its treatment of theology and mysticism, negative theology, and contemplative ecstasy. L. Reypens continues his significant studies in his article, "Dieu (connaissance mystique)," cols. 883-929, Fasc. 20-21, *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (1955). Richard of St. Victor emerges in a new light as regards liturgy and the equipoise of the contemplative and the active life, with texts newly edited by G. Dumeige, . . . *La quatre degrés de la violente charité* (Paris, 1955) and by J. Chatillon and W. J. Tulloch, *Sermons et opusculs spirituels inédits* (Vol. I, Bruges, 1951).

English monastic life is further clarified in Vol. II of D. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England: The End of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1955). Like Vol. I (1950) it is a work of solid erudition and irenic temper. The part played by "lay exploitation" in the deterioration of monastic houses is studied in its earlier phases as an aspect of Susan Wood's admirable *English Monasteries and their Patrons in the Thirteenth Century* (Oxford, 1955). Cistercian renunciation gets well-considered attention in J. A. Leffevre, "S. Robert de Molesme dans l'opinion monastique du XII<sup>e</sup> et du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Analecta Bollandiana* (nos. 1-2, 1956), and in his "Que savons-nous du Cîteaux Primitif?" *Rev. d'hist. ecclés.* (no. 1, 1956). Publications springing from the celebration year of 1953 continue from Germany (J. Lortz, *Bernhard von Clairvaux: Mönch und Mystiker* [Wiesbaden, 1955]) and from Italy (S. Bernardo [Milan, 1954]).

Truly distinguished offerings of the most varied sort can only be hinted at for the closely joined fields of art, liturgy, architecture, and iconography.

Otto Simson, *The Gothic Cathedral: Origins of Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept of Order* (New York, 1956) explores with deep-lying and wide-ranging analysis the very heart and root, not only of architectural forms, but also of medieval philosophy, theology, aesthetics, and mysticism. The work has real affinities with the Suger researches of Panofsky and Crosby, and with E. De Bruyne's, *Études d'esthétique médiévale* (3 vols., Brugge, 1946). In its weighing of sources, of the Pseudo-Dionysian tradition, and of the role of eschatological-social motifs in the everyday medieval milieu, the heavenly and the earthly hierarchies are seen in their most meaningful interactions. Real significance for the articulation of the historical principles and the contemporary forms of art and liturgy is implicit in the reports of "De quarto Congressu nationali italico liturgiae pastoralis et primo Congressu architecturae sacrae in Italia," (Bonn, 18-25 Sept., 1955), *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, LXIX, 4 (1955), 397-403. The liturgical participation of the people in the Sacrifice of the Mass and in the historic community of worship is brought to a productive focus.

Based on the sumptuous *Esplorazioni sotto la confessione di San Pietro in Vaticano eseguiti negli anni 1940-1949* is J. Tovynbee and J. W. Perkins, *The Shrine of St. Peter and the Vatican Excavations* (London, 1956), with a significant "Epilogue: St. Peter's and the Art and Architecture of Western Europe." Combining the historic elements of Christian art and texts is A. Ramelli's *Edifici per il culto: Manuali di composizione e tecnica nell'architettura moderna* (Milan, 1953). Further allied to liturgical creativity are the researches of G. Elard, *Master Alcuin, Liturgist* (Chicago, 1956). Full of historical interest and contemporary zest is the booklet by J. Gajard, *Gregorian Chant*, incorporating introductions and missal texts made to accompany the (English) Decca LP records LXT 2704-8 by the choir of the monks of the Abbey of

Saint Pierre de Solesmes. Noteworthy for the historical appreciation and the present day appropriation of the great medieval composer and liturgist are S. Levarie, *Guillaume de Machaut* (New York, 1954) and the Decca-Archive release of the Machaut Mass on LP record, Dec. ARC-3032. The popularly written, well buttressed study of A. Temko, *Notre-Dame of Paris* (New York, 1955), is not to be despised because it was a "Book-of-the-Month Club" selection. A delightful edition of monastic liturgical texts in Latin and German is A. Dold's *Sursum Corda* (Salzburg, 1954). E. Dekkers, "La messe du soir à la fin de l'antiquité et au moyen âge: notes historique," in *Sacris Erudiri*, VII (1955), 99-130 is a revealing study of a little known aspect of researches closely linked to Jungmann, Mohlberg, and other authorities on the mass.

Authoritative studies relate the tension between temporal and spiritual powers in a setting of pontifical reform and Christian imperial responsibility. G. B. Ladner, "Two Gregorian Letters: On the Sources and Nature of Gregory VII's Reform Ideology," *Studi Gregoriani*, V (1956), 221-242, stresses terminology, ideology, and the contextual meanings of law, custom, and Christian history. A. Nitschke, "Die Wirksamkeit Gottes in der Welt Gregors VII..." *Ibid.*, 115-219, analyzes contemporary documents and registers for the bearing of law, politics, and theology upon the outgrowth of papal theory and action.

Begun in *Ephemerides Iuris Canonici*, XI, 4 (1955), 361-408 was the first of P. Palazzini's intensively documented investigations of Damian's role in Church reform: "Il diritto strumento di riforma ecclesiastica in S. Pier Damiani." Examining the emergence of pontifical and imperial power in relation to each other and the divine commission of each is the work of A. Hof, "'Plenitudo potestatis' und 'imitatio imperii' zur Zeit Innocenz III.," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Vierte Folge IV, LXVI, Bd. 1945/55,



Heft. 1 & 2, pp. 39-71. With this compare R. Bauer, "Sacrum imperium et imperium Germanicum chez Nicolas de Cues," *Archives d'hist. doctr. et litt. du moyen âge*, XXI (1954), 207-240. The former continues many of the examinations of W. Ullman, *Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London, 1955), and the latter treats conciliar issues upon which B. Tierney's *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory* (Cambridge, 1955) has bearing. All are thoroughly documented inquiries.

Accenting English church life in relation to episcopal administration, royal claims, and pontifical prerogatives is the commemorative essay of the late Dr. Srawley in D. A. Callus, *Robert Grosseteste: Scholar and Bishop* (Oxford, 1955). The whole volume is a balanced work of the highest merit. The recent works of E. S. Duckett, *Saint Dunstan of Canterbury* (New York, 1955) and *Alfred the Great* (Chicago, 1956) are charming and informing.

Maurice Coens, "S. Boniface et sa mission historique d'après quelques auteurs récents," *Analecta Bollandiana*, LXIII, fasc. 3-4 (1955), 462-495 may be profitably read in connection with R. E. Sullivan, "The Papacy and Missionary Activity in the Early Middle Ages," in *Mediaeval Studies*, XVII (1955), 46-106. Valuable texts in French translation clarify Lull's missionary activities in R. S. De Franch, *Raymond Lulle, Docteur des Missions* (Nouvelle Revue de Science Missionnaire, 5, 1954). The basic theological grounding for all Lull's work is recalled by P. Erhardus W. Platzech, "De Valore ad mentem Beati Raimundi Lulli," *Antonianum*,

Annus XXX, fasc. 2 (Apr., 1955), 151-184, in a study of distinctive Lullian concepts placed over against the Blanquerna and other writings.

Hitherto unreported for its significant editing of texts relating to medieval heresy, inquisition, and the Dominican order is the *Archivum Fratrum Prædicatorum*. Typically erudite handling of sources is that of A. Dondaine on the Catharist hierarchy in Italy, vols. 19 (1949), and 20 (1950).

C. Stephenson and B. D. Lyon, *Medieval Institutions* (Ithaca, New York, 1954) has penetrating articles on feudalism with a reprint of an earlier study on "The Problem of the Common Man in Early Medieval Europe." R. Coulborn edits *Feudalism in History* (Princeton, 1956) with widely distributed studies for Western Europe, Byzantium, and other world areas and historical periods. G. Ostrogorsky, *Pour l'histoire de la Féodalité* (Brussels, 1954), is basic.

Crusade literature includes the recently completed, politically oriented set by S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* (Vol. III, New York, 1954); also the collaborative effort edited by K. M. Setton, et al., *A History of the Crusades* (Vol. I, Philadelphia, 1955). Far different in character is the appearance, twenty-one years after his death, of P. Alphandéry's notes revised by A. Dupront as *La chrétienté et l'idée de croisade*, Vol. I (Paris, 1954). Emphasizing the deep religious sub-consciousness of the masses, this work seeks to penetrate and evaluate the role of visions, prophecies, eschatological - apocalyptic factors, and the unsystematized religious passions of the common man.

## DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"An Examination of Luther's Treatment of *Anfechtung* in His Biblical Exegesis from the Time of the Evangelical Experience to 1545."

By Clarence Warren Hovland (Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon). Yale University, 1950.  
Director: Roland H. Bainton.

This study deals with Luther's treatment of *Anfechtung* in his Biblical exegesis during the period from his Evangelical Experience (1513) until the year before his death (1545). The problem is to discover just what he meant by *Anfechtung*, how it affects his piety and theology, and the relationship between his own experience of *Anfechtung* and his exegesis of the *Anfechtung* of Biblical characters including Christ. The sources for the study are chiefly Luther's sermons and his Biblical commentaries. *Anfechtung* is defined as *the terror the individual feels in the moment he is confronted with some dark aspect of God*. God confronts man as Judge, as Enemy, as Tempter, as the Hidden One, and as the Arbitrary One. The three special emphases of this study are: (1) it deals with the later writings of Luther, i.e., from 1513 until 1545; (2) it stresses the experimental character of Luther's thought; and (3) it seeks the key to this concept in his Biblical exegesis.

The section on Luther's own experience of *Anfechtung* first seeks to determine when these periods of depression and despair occurred. It is shown that they are to be found before his entry into the monastery, during the monastic period, after the Evangelical Experience, and as late as 1545. His worst year was 1527. Both the anxiety concerning faith (*Glaubensanfechtung*) and the anxiety concerning his ministry (*Berufsanfechtung*) continued throughout his life. An explanation of these periods of despair on the basis of the cycles of his

health is seen to be inadequate. His struggle was a part of the eternal quest of the soul, a struggle for the right picture of God and of his dealings with man. An examination of Luther's view of God in his Biblical exegesis is followed by a description of the response in man to *Anfechtung*. The general characteristics of the experience are: (1) a general undifferentiated feeling of anxiety, dread, and terror; (2) a feeling of metaphysical insecurity arises since the created order seems to be hostile; (3) the world seems to close in upon one (*Welt enge*) and there is the frustrated desire to escape; (4) there is the uneasy awareness of being involved in the time sequence when thoughts of death, judgment, and hell come to the fore; (5) the awareness of sinfulness and finitude causes feelings of unworthiness (*tentationes de indignitate*); and (6) thoughts of predestination (*Praedestinationsanfechtung*) tempt man to blasphemy and hatred of God (*odium dei*). The conscience is the battlefield where this struggle for man's soul takes place. The recommendations of Luther (as *Doctor Consolationis*) for those who are suffering *Anfechtungen* are then examined and compared with those of the Scholastics and Mystics.

The second chapter examines Luther's treatment of individual case studies of *Anfechtung* in the Biblical narrative. The *Anfechtungen* of Adam, Cain, Jonah, Joseph's Brothers, Moses, David, and those described in Psalm 32 occur when these individuals face God as the Judge; those of Job, Psalm 6, and Psalm 118 result from the fact that God appears as the Enemy; those of Eve, Judas, Peter, and Paul arise from the meeting with God as the Tempter; those of Jacob, Joseph, Mary and Psalm 110 come from God the Hidden One; and those of Abraham and the Canaanite Woman result from their meeting with God as the Ar-

bitrary One. In each instance the following factors are examined: (1) the cause of the *Anfechtung*; (2) the reaction to this by the individual; (3) the elements of comfort (*Trost*) or how release is effected; and (4) the purpose of the *Anfechtung*.

The third chapter is devoted to Luther's treatment of the *Anfechtungen* of Christ. It is based on a study of Luther's passion sermons and a comparison of his treatment of this theme in his commentaries on Psalm 22, which is given a tropological interpretation.

A short summary of Luther's views on *Anfechtung* concludes the study. The appendix contains an Excursus on the use of the first commandment in periods of *Anfechtung*, and an Excursus on his use of the "wind-driven leaf" idea (*Folium Sonsans*).

"The Early Quaker Outlook upon 'the World' and Society, 1647-1662." By Hugh Barbour (Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana). Yale University, 1952. Director: Roland H. Bainton.

The Quakers in their first fifteen years showed a vitality of ethical and spiritual world-conquest which differed in viewpoint as well as in energy from their more familiar later outlooks. Living in the time when Puritanism moulded English thought, Quakers kept the Puritan sense of ethical struggle, and the theocratic approach to Society.

The Quaker movement arose, however, among the dales and fells of northwestern England where church life and organization (whether Puritan, Anglican, Catholic or Baptist) had been neglected. In this region, a tradition of social discontent had persisted among the tenant-farmers, who formed the nucleus of the early Quaker movement. Quakerism later spread (in 1654-8) through southwestern England and among working people in Bristol and London. In all these areas, the mass meetings and intense emotionalism of the Quakers were similar to those in other religious

Awakenings among the uncultured, the unchurched and the socially disinherited.

In intense conversion experiences fostered by fiery Quaker preaching, early Friends commonly passed through bitter personal struggles centering upon personal conviction of sin, before finding inward peace. Self-surrender to the Spirit of God ensued. The Spirit was seen as manifested simultaneously in the emotional "power" which seized Quakers meeting together, in specific inward impulses or "leadings", and in the voice of awakened conscience. The ethical norms set up were close to those of the Bible and of Puritanism. But the "Inward Light" of the Spirit demanded an implicit obedience displacing the wills and reasonings of men. Quakers looked to the Spirit to provide specific ideas on all subjects, and for promptings to specific action in worship and daily life. Perfect obedience was the ideal and the ultimate criterion in ethics, and all aspects of daily life lay open to challenge.

The early Quakers were thus ethically radicals. They expected the power within them to transform the world. The natural world, while created good and useful as a whole, was especially seen as an instrument for God and his saints. But "the World" of sinful men was felt to be in rebellion against God, and all its ways and customs to be the fruit of human self-will. Quakers thus announced "the Lamb's War" against "the World". This war was fought equally against evil within the heart (their own, and all men's), and against worldly customs in society. The weapons of this war were preaching and suffering. Under the Spirit's leading ultimate victory was certain and expected soon.

Sharing many of the ideals and hopes of the Commonwealth rulers, the early Quakers regarded the state as God's intended instrument in establishing justice and reforming society. But Friends' theocratic outlook always implied absolute autonomy for the Spirit. Thus Friends insisted on reli-

religious liberty for men led by the Spirit. Friends also felt led and justified in performing acts of prophetic judgment which intruded into the lives of other men. Quaker passive resistance was the creative solution to the impasse created by their absolute conflicting religious claims. By rejecting violence they made possible mutual trust where beliefs were in conflict.

Friends' own social conduct, though involving rejection of many existing social customs, was mainly intended as a Testimony to win other men to obedience to the Light. By rejecting luxury and ornateness of dress and speech, Friends attacked the human pride which underlay these. Their rejection of all oaths and bargaining challenged dishonesty in "the World". Positive programs for mutual aid and legal reform showed Quaker concern from the beginning for the poor and unfortunate.

The intense persecutions of 1662-1689 in England ended Quaker expectations of world conquest. The leadings of the Light became the customs of a limited group. Positive relationships with the non-Quaker world were maintained, however. William Penn and others appealed to a common basis of human reason and the relativized conscience for limited reforms.

---

"Collegiate Education in the Methodist Episcopal Church South, 1902-1939." By Robert Glenn Massengale (Huntingdon College, Montgomery 6, Alabama). Yale University, 1950. Director of Thesis: Clyde M. Hill.

This study treats of the developments within the program of collegiate education in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, between 1902 and 1939. During the period, at least 110 schools purporting to do work of collegiate grade were related to the denomination. A comprehensive table, covering the dates of relationship, the location, and other pertinent information for each of these institutions is appended to this study.

At the turn of the century the Church faced a crisis in its program of collegiate education. Conditions in the South following the War Between the States, along with the failure of the denomination to assume responsibility for the direction and supervision of its educational enterprises, had resulted in the establishment of a large number of small colleges doing a sub-standard grade of work. Meanwhile, developments and prospects in the field of higher education threatened the usefulness, if not the continued existence, of all such institutions. In 1902 there were no less than eighty-four Southern Methodist schools purporting to do college work. These were characterized by the greatest diversity of standards, limitation of curricula, paucity of resources, and lack of correlation. Only one could be classified as a university and sixteen as colleges in accordance with the meagre standards set by the Church's Commission on Education. The relationship of the institutions to the denomination were of a vague and tenuous nature, and connectional policy and program was in its embryonic stage.

Between 1902 and 1939, developments in the Church's program of collegiate education were in the direction of fewer and stronger institutions strategically located. This study records how, under the impact of a growing and resolute connectional policy and program, the initiative and challenge of the more progressive institutions, and an able and aggressive denominational leadership, commendable progress was made in the development of an efficient educational system, the elevation of standards, the expansion and enrichment of curricula, the increase of financial resources, the strengthening of programs of Christian education, the achievement of mature policies of Church relationship and control, and the formulation of a statement of underlying philosophy and over-all policy for Southern Methodist endeavor in the field of higher education.

When, by action of the Uniting

Conference of 1939, the Methodist Episcopal church, South, ceased to exist as a separate denomination, it contributed three universities, twenty-six colleges, and sixteen junior colleges to the educational program of the Methodist Church. An evaluation of these institutions, based on an extensive study of their location, financial support, accreditation, correlation and cooperation with other Methodist colleges, distinctive religious service, and relation to the Church, reveals that the three universities, four-

teen of the colleges, and three of the junior colleges rated high in all of these categories. Six of the colleges and one junior college were located in areas where they were of great service to the denomination and were doing a relatively acceptable grade of work. The remaining six four-year colleges and twelve junior colleges were beset with uncertainties as to their status and future prospect and in need of further study and frank discussions as to their future in the educational program of the Church.



## BOOK REVIEWS

*Christ and the Caesars.* By ETHELBERG STAUFFER. (Translated by K. and G. Smith.) Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955. 293 pp. \$4.50.

Ethelbert Stauffer's book on the great conflict between the worship of Christ and the worship of the Emperor has been translated into English. The liveliness of the German original has been remarkably well preserved, and it will be a pleasure to recommend this essay in the classroom.

To begin with, it is an epic work. The constant growth of the conflict, the continuous confrontation of the two partners, the upward struggle of the Christian church and the inevitable downfall of the empire have been drawn in a dramatic, exciting style, and even the specialist on this early period will enjoy this presentation of the magnificent drama that took place from Tiberius to Constantine. With artistic freedom Stauffer has quit the footnote existence of the modern scholar simply by exposing a page-long original viewpoint.

The interest of this book lies further in the fact that Stauffer backs it up not merely by contemporary literary documents but by a vast amount of numismatic material. He thus achieves highly precious results—for instance, the brilliant explanation of Christ's saying about the rendering of the denarius to Caesar. Another example: the coins issued by the Syrian Abgar showing the Christian symbol, proving the old tradition about a Christian Empire of Edessa to be more than just legendary, even more so by the fact of the vanishing of the Christian signs as Caracalla stepped in toward the end of Abgar's rule. The numismatic element presents a colorful and vivid background for what was the issue during the whole period, from Augustus SAVING THE CITIZENS to the DEUS ET DOMINUS NATUS coin by Aurelian.

Should one mention that the book opens where no scholar would normally dare to in this demythologised day and age: at the story of the three wise men laying down at the feet of the Christ child the ancient myth of the East?

SAMUEL LAEUCHLI  
Garrett Biblical Institute

*The Early Christian Fathers. A Selection from the writings of the Fathers from St. Clement of Rome to St. Athanasius.* Edited and translated by HENRY BETTENSON. London: Oxford University Press, 1956. vii, 424 pp. \$4.00.

"The aim of this book is to illustrate . . . the process of development in Christian thought, life, and worship" by giving excerpts from the Fathers, almost exclusively in the ante-Nicene period. For readers who want a relatively brief, well translated, and generally representative introduction to early patristic thought, this is probably the best book available, even though it is not possible to enter thoroughly into the thought of the Fathers by reading excerpts. The collection well illustrates the general unity of patristic theology, though the editor does not always make clear the differences which exist; for example, it might have been well to observe that Clement gives evidence for apostolic succession but not for the monarchical episcopate, while the situation in Ignatius is the reverse. Again, the enthusiasm for Rome in Irenaeus is minimized in a footnote and neglected in Cyprian; the introduction (pp. 32-33) treats Cyprian as an episcopalian, while the note on *De unitate* 4 (p. 363) does not quite do justice to the "primacy" text (on p. 364, line 10, "Peter" should be "Paul"). On the whole, however, this is an excellent piece of work.

ROBERT M. GRANT  
University of Chicago

*Theological Education in the Alexandrian School.* By VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS. Istanbul: The Patriarchal Press, 1956. Paper. 144 pp. (In Greek).

The recent publication of Dr. Vasil T. Istavridis' book, *Theological Education in the Alexandrian School*, in Greek, by the Patriarchal Press in Istanbul, Turkey, is particularly timely. Professor Istavridis originally wrote the work in English as a doctoral dissertation (Th.D.) at Boston University's School of Theology in 1951. His special interest has always been the Oecumenical Movement and, as a result, he has been actively engaged in the teaching of the history of the Oecumenical Movement to students at the Theological School of Halki, Istanbul, Turkey.

This study is limited to the first and more important half of the history of the Alexandrian School (180-232/235) and does not deal with the second half which extends to the fifth century A.D. Though many other such schools existed (for example, at Rome, Antioch, and Edessa), none reached the heights attained by the Catechetical School of Alexandria and none exerted such a powerful influence on the development of the Christian Church as a whole.

Dr. Istavridis begins with a discussion of the city of Alexandria, its non-Christian characteristics, geography, political history, a general study of the civilization, education, philosophy, and letters of pagans and Jews in Alexandria, its beginnings, life, and development as well as a treatment of the various heretical groups, particularly Gnosticism. In the second main division of his work, Dr. Istavridis examines the various terms, the foundation and chronological limits of the Alexandrian School, the lives and works of its teachers, and finally presents us with a picture of the School's productive activity. Then after some introductory material, we are presented with a systematic treatment of the teaching methods as catechetical, encyclical, philosophic, ethical, and final-

ly, theological. Lastly comes an attempt to reconstruct as accurately as possible the teachings of the faculty.

Any discussion of the Alexandrian School cannot but take into consideration the two most outstanding representatives of the faculty, namely Clement and Origen, both of whom served as directors of the Alexandrian School in the first half of the third century A.D. For both men training in secular philosophy was of paramount importance in penetrating behind the Divine Mysteries. The Christian theologian had to come to grips with pagan philosophy and pagan philosophy meant specifically the philosophy of the Greeks, Plato in particular. As a consequence, the system of allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures came into being.

Christian theology thus became a "divine science" and both Clement and Origen were instrumental in the shaping of this "science." Dr. Istavridis deals with both of these men in considerable detail.

JOHN E. REXINE  
Brandeis University

*Transiency and Permanence. The Nature of Theology according to St. Bonaventure.* By GEORGE H. TAVARD. A. A. St. Bonaventure, N. Y.: The Franciscan Institute, 1954. vii, 263 pp. \$3.75.

The principal purpose of the present book seems to be that of setting forth St. Bonaventure's conception of theology, both as one deriving from patristic sources, mainly Augustinian, and as relevant to current discussions among theologians concerning the place and value of the teachings of the Church Fathers on the nature of theology. In this regard, the theories of Bonaventure are held to be especially significant because they are "the ultimate point of development of pre-Thomistic theology" and "St. Thomas is usually held as having utterly transformed the atmosphere of theological work." (p. 3)

The main body of the work consists of an interpretation of texts drawn

from the principal works of Bonaventure on the characteristics of religious thinking. The limitations and deficiencies of reason and philosophy, the practical nature of theology, the essential relation of religious thinking with mysticism and the progress of the soul toward the beatific vision are taken up in turn.

In the concluding chapter, after some brief remarks on points at issue between St. Bonaventure and his followers and the Thomists, Father Tvard states his own views on the nature of theology. It "is a journey of the soul from the mere statement of the mysteries of faith to as thorough an understanding of them as may be acquired in this life. Faith is the constant milieu within which that journey takes place." There are three stages in this journey. "The first stage brings the mystery in question under the light of the other mysteries. This is known as the principle of the analogy of faith. . . ." This involves interrelation between three ways in which the mysteries of Christianity may be viewed: "their Scriptural expression . . . , the traditional data concerning them . . . , the modern Christian outlook, which for a part results from the past and for another is inseparable from the circumstances of the 20th century . . . . Our here and now conceptions are an aspect of theology insofar as they follow upon spontaneous assumptions of Christians living in the modern world." Hence the possibility of progress, for our understanding of religious realities is "capable of progress and never reaches a point beyond which it could not go." Thus, in the course of time, "an improving awareness of the analogy of faith grows and commands . . . new theological syntheses." (pp. 255-6). In the second stage the data of natural reason are brought to bear on the data of faith progressively elaborated in the first stage. Here non-Thomistic philosophies, new as well as old, have a contribution to make. The third stage, continuous with the others, is that of analogy, the highest level of

spiritual and mystical experience possible in this life.

The foregoing are interesting suggestions. If the author had shown that there was some direct bearing of St. Bonaventure's teachings on his own views concerning the first two stages he might have made a valuable contribution. Unhappily he has not done this. It remains an unproved possibility that Bonaventure had in mind in any degree the kind of developmental or constructive theology that Father Tvard espouses. As to the differences between Bonaventure and Aquinas concerning the nature of theology, scholars have long recognised them. For Bonaventure, concrete connections are more important than formal distinctions. In his teaching, developed from that of St. Augustine, the actual cultivation of theology is a stage in the life of the soul, inseparable from living faith and ultimate attainment of the beatific vision. St. Thomas, on the other hand, while not concerned to deny such a view, is more concerned with the identification of theology abstractly as a specific kind of "science," possessed by scholars who may also be saints, but one which saints may perfectly well forego.

It must be said, finally, that the author's exposition is in many respects faulty. References are seldom adequate; quotations are often truncated and inaccurately translated; in general, interpretations are built up from a mosaic of texts, taken from places far apart in the work of his source. In addition, there are frequent departures from ordinary English usage. For example, in referring to Professor Gilson's interpretation of Bonaventure, the author writes: "A cryptic statement, that smells of contradiction, makes one stagger;" (then a quotation from Gilson, with some comment, followed by:) "Starting from an excessive streamlining of the problem, Gilson's explanation peters out in a puzzle." (p. 122)

WILLIAM O'MEARA

*University of Chicago*

*The Eastern Schism. A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XIth and XIIth centuries.* By STEVEN RUNCIMAN. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1955. viii, 190 pp. \$3.40.

The break between Byzantium and Rome was probably the major tragedy in the history of Christendom. It is inaccurate and misleading to speak of the Eastern Schism. The term suggests that there was "One Church," from which the East broke away, at a certain date, or rather was breaking away gradually and persistently. It is precisely what the West finally came to believe. It is natural that the East finally took the opposite view and came to believe that there was actually but a "Western Schism." Strangely enough, both views are valid and correct, from the historical point of view. What actually happened was the disruption of Unity, and both "separated" parts of Christendom are, in a certain sense, "schisms." In any case, it is so from the purely historical point of view. In spite of all tensions and divergences, conspicuous and provocative as they might have been, the Christian world in the XIth century was still "one world," and people, both in the West and in the East, did firmly believe in this "unity." There was still "one universe of discourse," much as its scope and character might have been already obscured on both sides. Paradoxically, it was precisely this presupposition of "unity" that precipitated the "schism." The Western "*Drang nach Osten*," of which the Crusades were the most spectacular expression, was inspired precisely by this basic conviction that the "Christian World" was one, and consequently had to be "united" and "unified."

Dr. Runciman is well aware of this situation. In fact, he wants to restore the balance in the interpretation of the problem, which has been so often treated onesidedly, from the "Latin" point of view. He wants to re-emphasize the legitimacy and the validity of the "Byzantine" point of view. In a brief volume, reproducing a series of

occasional lectures, he could not give an exhaustive analysis of the most involved matters. But, such as it is, his book contributes immensely to the clarification of many controversial issues. And, first of all, the "schism" was not only a split "in the Church," in a strictly theological sense. It was a split in the world at large. It was a cultural, and political, separation, and not only a "separation of Churches." And, for that reason, it was effected by an intricate contexture of "non-theological factors." One of them was the impact of German influence on the policy, and mentality, of the Roman Church itself. At this point Runciman could have said more than he actually says on the conflict between "Rome" and "Byzantium" in their missionary competition among the Slavs, and not only in the early period, in the times of Photius, but in the later times also, in the period of Crusades and the Latin Empire of the East. He seems to be right in stressing the intervention of the Cluniacs against the conciliatory policy of John XIX, although the authenticity of the communication of Radulf Glaber about the Byzantine proposal of 1025, suggesting a formal demarcation between the two areas, Roman and Byzantine, has been persistently contested (in vain, as far as I can see). Runciman is right also in stressing the importance of the fact that, during the Crusades, the whole contest had reached the "mass-level." Ever since, the tension has been not only between theologians and ecclesiastics, but between masses and nations.

It seems, however, that Runciman does not take enough into consideration the general and cultural change in the West, the growth of a new mentality and spirit. His book was written before the publication of the admirable symposium, *L'Eglise et Les Eglises. 1054-1954. Neuf Siècles de douloureuse separation entre l'Orient et l'Occident. Etudes et Travaux offerts à Dom Lambert Beauduin*, published by the Benedictines of Chevetogne (1954 & 1955, 2 volumes). The

excellent article by Pere Yves Congar, O.P., "Neuf cents ans après" (vol. I, p. 3-95), is an indispensable supplement to Runciman's analysis, especially in what he says on the shift in the theological method in the West, dating from the end of the XIth century (p. 43 ff.). One could have said more about the "Filioque clause," although the few remarks Runciman makes (p. 30f.) are very helpful. It was not the "cause" of the schism, and probably the problem could have been settled, in the times of Photius at least. But, obviously, it was not an accident that it was not settled, and that the controversy was permitted to develop at this precise point. One may read with profit the remarkable "*Thesen ueber Filioque*" by Professor V. V. Bolotov, first published, without the name of the author, in the Old-Catholic periodical, "Révue Internationale de Théologie", VI.4, 1898. Bolotov shows there how the two "theologoumena", the Eastern and the Western, can be reconciled in a fair and comprehensive synthesis. It is necessary to mention, however, that Bolotov's "theses" were not favourably accepted in the East, just as the conciliatory suggestions of the Bonn Reunion Conferences on the same matter in 1875 only provoked an intransigent intervention of the great Dr. Pusey. Without having been a "cause" of the schism, the "Filioque clause" is still the touchy point in the theological dialogue between the Orthodox and the Westerners (including a large proportion of the "non-Roman" Christians). This can hardly be just an "accident".—Without being the "last word" in the long discussion of the great historical problem, which Runciman, of course, does not claim, his book is an important contribution to this discussion and a noble specimen of an impartial treatment of an involved subject.

GEORGES FLOROVSKY

Harvard Divinity School.

*Stained Glass of the Middle Ages in England and France.* By HUGH

ARNOLD. With fifty plates in color by Lawrence B. Saint. New York: Macmillan, 1955. xiv, 269 pp. \$8.50.

This book, which was first published in 1913, is here reprinted from the second edition of 1939. It is an introduction to the art and craft of the medieval stained-glass window, written by a man who combined the practical knowledge of one who has himself worked in this field of art with an unusual degree of esthetic sensitivity. The same is true for the author of the illustrations. Indeed, L. B. Saint's colored drawings—the originals of which were purchased by the Victoria-and-Albert Museum—are such splendid additions to this book that in the minds of many a reader they will eclipse the text. If one compares these illustrations with most photographic reproductions of medieval windows available today, one realizes how superior the human eye—at least the eye of an eminent artist—is to the photographic lens.

In its historical part the book unfortunately contains a large number of inaccuracies and errors of fact. It is untrue that the "traditions (of the making of stained-glass windows) do not extend back beyond the great times of gothic architecture." (p. 3) The well known treatise on the arts by the Presbyter Theophylus, written before 1100 A.D. and reflecting artistic practices of the first half of the eleventh century, attests the importance of stained-glass making at this time. (Arnold dated the treatise "no later than the thirteenth century.") A head from Wissembourg certainly predates the twelfth century; another one from Magdeburg Cathedral (destroyed in the last war) cannot be later than c. 1000 A.D., while a third fragment, found at Lorsch, may even be Carolingian. None of these precious pieces was known to Arnold. He speculates whether or not the lost sixth century windows of Hagia Sophia at Constantinople were colored, but is unaware that a number of colored windows of this very period,



from San Vitale at Ravenna, are preserved in the museum of this city.

Again, on the basis of dubious collateral evidence that today has been almost generally discarded, Arnold inclined, against his own intuitive judgment, to assign the celebrated Ascension and Crucifixion windows in the cathedrals of Le Mans and Poitiers to the end of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, respectively. These windows are now generally thought to belong to the mid-twelfth century and indeed to the same school. The dedication of the Abbey of St.-Denis took place in 1144 (not 1142), and there is no reason to date the three great windows of the West facade of Chartres as early as 1145-50. Art historians will balk at the continuous use of the term "byzantine" for anything pre-Gothic and even more at Arnold's contention that the general change of style which he finds in windows from the fourteenth century onward was caused by the "weakening of the religious motive" and the pre-occupation with "Art for Art's sake" on the part of the artists of this period. (p. 126)

As one looks at the state of publications in the historical field today one wonders if publishers have come to consider readability and accuracy incompatible virtues; or if the general public, if presented with a pleasant and readable book, is not entitled to expect, or not supposed to care for historical accuracy. Arnold died in the first World War. It would have been easy and inexpensive to revise his book in the light of recent scholarship. As it is, the reader of *Stained Glass of the Middle Ages* will get a useful, if simplified, description of medieval glass making, a perceptive appreciation of a selected number of famous English and French windows, and an obsolete and unreliable account of the development of this great art.

OTTO G. VON SIMSON  
*University of Chicago.*

---

*The Foundations of Conciliar Theory. The Contribution of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to*

the Great Schism. By BRIAN TIERNEY. (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. New Series. Volume 4). New York: Cambridge University Press, 1955. xi, 280 pp. \$5.00.

Until a few decades ago the term "Conciliarism" was unfamiliar to students and the subject was given little notice even in major text-books on Church History. The topic has now become familiar through many books in which it is competently treated and through courses of lectures and research seminars in a number of schools of theology. The present work is a weighty contribution to our expanding knowledge of Conciliarism though it is confined to a modestly limited segment of the field, as the author clearly indicates in his preface:

It is not a complete account of medieval canonistic theories on Church government, for it emphasizes only those elements in canonistic thought that contributed to the growth of Conciliar Theory; it is not, on the other hand, a complete history of conciliar thought down to the time of the Great Schism, for it does not deal with the well-known publicistic literature of the fourteenth century.

Dr. Tierney keeps his course within these bounds, and finds abundant material to justify the inquiry. He sees as inadequate the view of V. Martin that Conciliarism was a radical departure from tradition inspired by the condemned heretics Marsiglio and Ockham, and regards as equally unsatisfactory the position of J. N. Figgis who looked for its origins in the constitutional experiments of secular states. On the highly important question of the historical relations between secular political structures and church polities he does not commit himself. In a brief reference he seems to resign this issue to the hands of Dr. Gaines Post whose arresting articles in learned periodicals have stimulated the interest of scholars in important phases of medieval representation. It is a little surprising that the suggestions furnished by Dr. Post's researches of the fruitful interplay between canon and civil law in constitu-

tional matters, have not here called forth from a canonist some fresh facts and judgments.

Within its limitations, the book is an able and rewarding study. Tierney holds that in the fourteenth-century strife over papal power and representative government in the Church "both parties alike drew their weapons from the canonist's armoury." There was an ambiguity within decretalist theory in the treatment of papal authority. It was held that "the Pope was supreme judge in cases involving articles of faith," but not that his "decisions were to be regarded as necessarily unerring statements of the unfailing faith of the Church." This way of thinking made the papal authority more vulnerable than the Decretalists realized. Gratian's successors began to affirm that the Pope could not reject the decisions of General Councils on an article of faith. There was also a problem of the relation of *Romana ecclesia* locally conceived and the *congregatio fidelium* spread over the world. The Cardinals were involved in this, since the Sacred College was developed as "a standing body of the Pope's most intimate counsellors." Theory dealt, too, with the authority of the Cardinals; the high view of this actually gave them authority over the Pope (*Glossa palatina*, ca. 1210).

Having in Part I dealt with "Decretalist Theories of Church Government" our author turns in Part II to treat "Aspects of Thirteenth-Century Ecclesiology." Here three meaty chapters show the growth of the idea of the Church as a corporation. Dr. Tierney feels that this idea was always open to such a restatement as "would lay all the emphasis on the due participation of the members rather than on the unique authority of the head." The service of this notion to Conciliarism is obvious. This is exemplified if we compare two statements in the book, 60 pages apart, on the Conciliarist Zabarella, who taught that the Pope held his authority as head of a corporation, and who could also say, "*Ecclesia nihil est aliud quam congregatio fidelium*". The very phrase that had

long stood for unqualified papal power, *plenitudo potestatis*, came to be given a conciliarist interpretation; and the great authority of Hostiensis (d. 1271) was lent to the view that the Pope's power was shared by members of his corporation, the Sacred College, of which Hostiensis was a member.

Part III, on "Conciliar Ideas in the Fourteenth Century", offers less that is novel than do the preceding parts, but it is written with evidence of independent search of many sources. Due attention is given to John of Paris<sup>1</sup> at the outset. The venerable Dominican's arguments for the restriction of papal authority are explained on the ground that while he avoided the pedantic erudition of some canonists of his time, he "could set himself instead to select from the canonistic works of the previous century a group of significant but unrelated doctrines and then to combine them in a new and daring synthesis." The possibility that John felt also the influence of his long familiarity with the Dominican Order's representative system (a view for which some evidence has been presented by the present reviewer) is entirely overlooked. John's patchwork use of canonist materials is duly shown, but this does not of itself explain his mind and motives. Unfortunately only incidental references are made to such eminent Conciliarists as Gerson, D'Ailly, Henry of Langenstein and Dietrich of Niem. Dr. Tierney recognizes a fact that many interpreters of Conciliarism have been slow to see, when he remarks: "The urgent, widespread desire for unity in the Church was the very life blood of the Conciliar Movement." He asks for a just evaluation of their ideas in relation to the critical situation in which the Church stood in their time, and ends his book wondering what measure of reform would have come if they had succeeded.

The main service of the book is its addition to our factual information on aspects of canonist theory, but it has far-reaching if rather tentative suggestions of broad interpretation so

that it is the kind of book that is likely to generate others. Footnotes are ample. A valuable feature is Appendix III, "Notes on Canonists and Anonymous Works Mentioned." A list of books cited fills more than ten pages, and the index is adequate.

JOHN T. MCNEILL

*Christian Eschatology and Social Thought: A Historical Essay on the Social Implications of some Selected Aspects in Christian Eschatology to A.D. 1500.* By RAY C. PETRY. New York & Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 415 pp. \$5.00.

Fully aware that "the hope for a full recovery of Christian vitality in our exhausted world lies...in the revived appreciation of a valid Christian eschatology" (p. 45), Dr. Petry shows in two introductory chapters that the ultimate Kingdom and the present social order have to be differentiated, but without losing their vital correlation. For the present order is not that of the ultimate community; but "the social present is under the demands of the social future" (ib.).

Chapters III to VI deal with "The Response of Temporal Society to the Eternal Kingdom". "In the Thought of Jesus" (ch. III), the Kingdom of God is an eschatological power as well as a social one, bringing the perfection of the Deuteronomic double commandment (p. 66), a new justice, which, for rescuing humanity, must be more than human. "In the Thought of the Early Church" (ch. IV), this Kingdom is waited for as a new world of brotherliness, because of which—"by no means in spite of which" (p. 78)—Christians have to show "a type of conduct in the existing society that shall prove their allegiance to the future city" (ib., referring to Phil. 3, 20). "From the outset of the Middle Ages Through Bernard of Cluny" (ch. V—for Bernard of Cluny see Dr. Petry's article in *Speculum* XXIV [1949] 207-17), in all that conjuring up of the Terrors of the last Judgment against contemporary leaders, nothing else but that

allegiance to the future city is meant. "From Hildegard of Bingen to the Later Middle Ages" (ch. VI), such different spirits as Hildegard, Peter of Blois, Vincent of Beauvais, Thomas Aquinas, Wiclif, and many others, who could not deny Augustine, "felt the magnetic lure of a great society transcendent to history" (p. 143).

This calls for an evaluation of the Church: "The Ecclesiastical Community as Servant of the Eternal Kingdom in the Temporal World" (chapters VII to XII). Ch. VII shows that "the concept of the Church as being in itself a community that joins the eternal and the temporal world is basic throughout the Church's literature" (p. 157). "With its great universal mission," the Church, being in this world, is "also as little of this world as Christ himself" (p. 171). I find in this chapter the center of Dr. Petry's work. In the following five chapters is shown how far the eschatological-social character of the Church is also basic for the typical prereformatory structures of the ecclesiastical hierarchy (ch. VIII), of the sacramental and liturgical life (ch. IX), of the conception of priesthood and kingdom (ch. X), of "The Spiritual Church, the Mystical Body of Christ and the Communion of Saints" (ch. XI) and of the "Corpus Christianum" (ch. XII). Here a great cloud of witnesses, as different as Pseudo-Dionysius, Aquinas, Ockham, or even Marsilius of Padua, appears. But here perhaps some questions will remain for the grateful reader. There is, e.g., a relationship between the Pseudo-Dionysian hierarchy and the eschatological and social message of the Gospel. But what kind of relationship? Does the Pseudo-Dionysian spirit really express some central thoughts of the Gospel, or does it rather supersede them?

In any case, the medieval Church never forgot the proper eschatology of the Last Things. The social character of the Resurrection, of the Last Judgment (ch. XIII/XIV) and of the Heavenly Beatitude (ch. XV) is dis-

played in an impressive manner through many testimonies.

The last chapter ("Christian Eschatology and Social Thought: Retrospect and Prospect") gives a comprehensive and critical analysis. We still might ask for further enlargement (in spite of ch. VIII) of the author's statement "that the root concept of priesthood and hierarchy is an eschatological one" (p. 373). But we fully agree with and admire his brief but suggestive criticism of the medieval perversion of social *agape* into that "bookkeeping system" of merits and rewards. However, Dr. Petry is right to emphasize that eschatological responsiveness remained strong and unextinguished by such deteriorations—"until Trent at least" (p. 379).

There is a mine of wealth in the examples given in this work, and bibliographical references (also to the research of Dr. Petry himself) open a wide horizon. No side of ancient and medieval theology, preaching, liturgy is forgotten. And if we seek some figures in vain, we should not forget that only examples could be given. Thus we do not meet, e.g., the great preacher Berthold of Regensburg with his strong eschatological concern; but for him his Franciscan brother Anthony of Padua, who is well discussed, may speak.

MARTIN ANTON SCHMIDT  
*Emory University.*

*The Development of Modern Christianity Since 1500.* By FREDERICK A. NORWOOD. New York, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 256 pp. \$3.75.

In the Preface Professor Norwood sets forth his objectives for this book. "The primary purpose . . . is to portray briefly the development of Christianity in the context of modern history." The secondary purpose is to depict the rise of the modern variations of churches and sects, culminating in an attempt to demonstrate that these varieties are expressing "an inner and continuing unity through the Ecumenical Movement."

The book is well planned. Five chapters, appropriately divided into sections, treat the subject under discussion. Chapter I handles "From Revelation to Reformation"; Chapter II "The Age of Reform"; Chapter III "The Age of Enlightenment"; Chapter IV "The Age of Progress"; and Chapter V "The Age of Turmoil." Included are well done bibliographical sections appended to each chapter, designed to promote further reading by the stimulated reader, and a surprisingly full index.

It seems to this reviewer that Professor Norwood has succeeded almost unfortunately well in achieving at least part of his primary objective. He intends "to portray briefly" and this he does. He portrays rather than reveals. The consequence is a bare, linear depiction lacking in depth and comprehension. He intends to be brief, and brief he really is. He lays out the information he considers necessary with marked parsimony of detail or enlightening and enlivening ramification.

By intent, then, this is a thin survey of the Christian movement since 1500. Its impact is measurably impaired by Professor Norwood's marked predilection for the Anglo-Saxon wing of the movement. After the chapter on the Reformation, small concern is shown for Continental and Eastern developments. Kant gets a spare twenty word clause; Hegel is dismissed with the two words "Hegelian dialectic"; Kierkegaard gets three lines, Schleiermacher ten, Barth seven and Brunner is not even mentioned. The entire story of the Eastern Orthodox Churches since the Reformation is granted slightly more than eight pages. On the other hand the English and American scenes (Canada excepted, for it rates but two passing references) get the lion's share of the attention.

In a book which is professedly a survey the criteria of emphases and inclusion might well have been determined with somewhat greater precision, or the limitations of the criteria should have been set forth in the Pref-

ace. As it stands the work is severely out of balance. One example will serve to illustrate the point. Nine pages are given to the Wesleyan movement in England and only thirteen pages to the entire ecumenical movement, which, according to the Preface, was to have been the cap-stone of the entire story.

This book may serve as an introduction to the Christian movement since 1500, but it will not place that movement, as anticipated, "in the context of modern history." Unless the book is widely supplemented by additional readings it will not afford the reader a very adequate picture of that movement.

Professor Norwood succeeded too well in carrying out his primary objective. Perhaps he will expand the work by another two hundred pages in order to fill out the story.

RICHARD C. WOLF

*Oberlin School of Theology*

*The Mennonite Encyclopedia*, Vol. I, A-C. Scottsdale, Penn.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1955. xvi, 749 pp. + 47 pp. illustrations. \$10.00.

*The Mennonite Encyclopedia* undertakes to cover the entire story of the Mennonites from their beginnings in the sixteenth century to the present time and in all of those areas into which they have been dispersed by persecution or to which they have gone through missionary zeal. A list of the places to which articles are devoted in this first volume is indicative of the scope: Basel, Berne, Brazil, California, Canada, China, Chortitza in Russia, Chur, Cleve and Constance. The doctrines and practices of the Mennonites throughout their history are treated in such general articles as those on Alcohol, Avoidance, Ban, Chiliasm, Choirs, Church, Communism, Community of Goods, Confessions of Faith and Confirmation. Economic life is covered under such rubrics as Business, Clocks and Crafts. Modern problems are treated in the articles on Civilian Public Service and Conscientious Objector.

For the student of the Reformation there are a few articles of general interest and a good many biographies. The article "Anabaptism" contains a very interesting discussion on the senses in which the term has been employed. Robert Friedmann, the author of this article, is commendably modest when he concludes that his treatment is mainly a refutation of unsatisfactory views and that a full and proper picture of Anabaptism remains to be drawn.

In this first volume, due to the vagaries of the alphabet, the number of Anabaptists is less than that of their opponents. Among the Anabaptists one finds Blaurock, Brötl, Bündlerlin, Campanus, and Castelberger; among the opponents, Beza, Brenz, Brunfels, Butzer, Bugenhagen, Bullinger, Calvin, Capito, Charles V and Cochlaeus. Be it said that these men differ greatly as to the extent of their rejection of Anabaptism and as to the methods to be employed to reclaim or destroy the Anabaptists. Among the consistent defenders of the Anabaptists one finds Castellio and Coornhert. Sebastian Franck does not fall in this volume, but there is a valuable article on his *Chronica Zeytbuch und Geschycht-bibel* and its influence among the Anabaptists.

Movements akin to that of the Mennonites receive treatment such as: Baptist, Brownists and Brethren. Historians of Anabaptism, if deceased, are given brief biographies including Barge, Bossert, Blaupot ten Cate, Cornelius, and Samuel Cramer.

I feel disposed to take issue only with one article, that of Robert Friedmann on Antitrinitarianism. He is willing to concede only two Anabaptists antitrinitarians. One of those was not properly an Anabaptist and the other was disowned, but this exoneration of the Anabaptists appears to me to rest on definition so that, if one was an antitrinitarian, he cannot have been an Anabaptist. I would hold out for calling Servetus an Anabaptist. He rejected infant baptism and he shared the chiliasm and moderate messianism



of some of the Anabaptists. His work *Restitutio Christianismi* took its title from a cardinal Anabaptist idea. The only ground on which he could be excluded would be that he was not a member of an Anabaptist congregation and did not make an open profession of his faith. This would certainly preclude calling him a Mennonite or a Hutterite, but I would be disposed to use the term Anabaptist in a broader way. Again there are some who definitely meet all of Friedmann's tests for the Anabaptist such as Melchior Hofmann and Menno himself who held a doctrine of the flesh of Christ which perhaps is not strictly incompatible with the doctrine of the Trinity, but is certainly very precarious because, if Christ did not have a genuine human body, there is danger that the doctrine of the Trinity will be interpreted in terms of modalism. This is not the orthodox position.

All in all, this is an admirable piece of scholarship.

ROLAND H. BAINTON

*Yale Divinity School.*

---

*Puritanism in Old and New England.* By ALAN SIMPSON. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956. ix, 126 pp. \$3.00.

In the past twenty years Puritanism has been the subject of much intensive new study, particularly in the area of Puritan piety and thought. Such scholars as A. S. P. Woodhouse, Perry Miller, and William Haller have improved our understanding of the movement in many respects. In these six lectures for the Walgreen Foundation, Professor Simpson has now drawn on these researches to analyze the meaning and history of Puritanism in both England and America. Brief, clear, and gracefully written, this work may claim to be the most satisfactory introduction to the subject which has yet appeared.

The author has a definite point of view, however. He regards Puritanism (not without some distaste) as "a species of enthusiasm with its own

sources of inspiration and frustration." He has little patience with superficial definitions of Puritanism in terms of dissatisfaction with the state church and less with the recent vogue of economic interpretation. He dismisses modernization of Puritanism such as the view that Roger Williams was an "irrepressible democrat" and more gently rebukes Miller for his preoccupation with the rational and scholastic side of Puritan expression. Instead, he finds the key to Puritanism in the conversion experience, a great spiritual climax filling the heart of the new saint with triumphant conviction of salvation and nerving him for a life of ceaseless battle against sin. For such men the discipline of society followed the discipline of self. Hence the goal was a holy community dedicated to the production of saints. The author swiftly explicates the various solutions to the problem of relating the elect to an unregenerate society—from Presbyterianism on the right to millenarianism and Leveller democracy on the left. His conclusion is that in every case—in Massachusetts and Rhode Island as well as in revolutionary England—these heroic efforts were doomed by inevitable theological divisions and especially by the decay of the original zeal and dedication. This "bankruptcy" of the "crusade" in its various forms is the central thesis of the book.

The strength of these essays lies in their judgment, their careful balancing of theological and political factors, and their lucidity of expression. This especially characterizes the examination of Puritan intellectual development, but it is also true of the handling of the political story. Only one caution ought perhaps to be kept in mind. Analysis necessarily simplifies, but the troubled actors in the Puritan drama sometimes confused their roles, behaving in unexpected ways. Thus in actual fact some millenarians did make place for democratic ideas; some Levellers were mystics; few mystics were anarchists; Quakerism invited individualistic

tendencies but developed a stronger corporate sense; and so on.

In the last chapter the author makes certain brief judgments on the place of the Puritan tradition in British and American history. He suggests relations to religious revivalism in general and to nineteenth-century evangelicalism in particular. In his final summing up, he believes that though Puritanism contributed to limited government, political initiative, education, and moral seriousness, and de-emphasized class divisions by providing religious issues which worked across or concealed them, its theocratic drive "with its pressure to turn politics, which ought to be the art of reconciliation, into a moral crusade, reminds us of the darkest blot on [its] political record."

J. F. MACLEAR

University of Minnesota (Duluth).

*Milton and Forbidden Knowledge.*

By HOWARD SCHULTZ. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1955. vii, 309 pp. No price given.

Nothing in Milton's work has caused more shock and dismay than the bitter attack on Greek philosophy made by the Christ of *Paradise Regained*. Many have read it and its accompanying depreciation of Greek poetry and drama as a repudiation of the values upon which Milton the Christian humanist had built his life; old, blind, defeated, and disillusioned, they argued, he at last surrendered his faith in reason and sought refuge in obscurantist pietism. The unshaken classicism of the preface to *Samson Agonistes* has not reassured these critics; rather, they have sought an early date of composition for what has traditionally stood as Milton's last poem, for it was not credible that after such an agonized revulsion against the position of a lifetime as they saw in *Paradise Regained* Milton should quietly and unconcernedly return to the old attitude in his next poem, as if nothing had happened.

Against this view there have al-

ways been some who insisted upon reading Christ's denunciation in context: he was rejecting Satan's advice here as he had rejected his gifts earlier in the poem—not that the proffered things were bad in themselves, but because they were brought by Satan ("Thereafter as I like/The giver"), and because they were not sent by the Father ("Who brought me hither/Will bring me hence"). Learning, such readers pointed out hopefully, had this advantage over the objects of the earlier temptations, that it was not in Satan's actual gift; it could not then be worse, and surely was better, than the things that were in his gift; and these things were in the theological sense "indifferent", although clearly not suitable in Christ's special situation. But these readers did not disguise their uneasiness, for even apart from the strength and bitterness of Christ's attack, why did Milton bring learning into the temptation in the wilderness at all? The hunger, and the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, were in Matthew and Luke, but nothing of human learning; and it was hard to deny that Milton introduced learning in order to give his Christ the opportunity to say some very harsh things about it.

Mr. Schultz's book does more to relieve this embarrassment, and generally to reinforce and clarify the view that *Paradise Regained's* criticism of learning is a limited and particular criticism, than anything that has come before. Employing the method that has so often in recent years solved perplexing difficulties in the interpretation of authors of the past, the history of ideas, he has recovered the contexts in which Milton from time to time throughout his career discussed human learning; and his study is as informative along the way as his conclusions are interesting. He separates *Paradise Regained* and the pamphlets of 1659 (*Of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes* and *The Likeliest Means to Remove Hirelings out of the Church*) from the rest of Milton's work, and argues that in the

larger group everything that is said about human learning is fundamentally conventional; i.e., it derives from the long tradition in which humanists as well as others condemned "curiosity" (dubious speculation) and "vain philosophy" (corrupted learning). Some, of course, condemned all learning as vain; the humanist view was that to be sound study must be ultimately reducible to morality ("Know thyself"), and the Christian humanist added that to be right it must be delimited by and subserve theology. Milton's most ardent youthful fealty to Pythagoras and Plato, his maturer *Of Education and Areopagitica*, never transcend these limits, nor do the warnings of Raphael and Michael in *Paradise Lost* restrict them: they are all variant aspects of a consistent attitude toward the rôle of reason in the life of a Christian man.

*Paradise Regained*, says Schultz, is different; it edifies not the individual but an institution, the church. This strictly ecclesiastical application of the poem ("Milton meant the Head of the Christian church to set a pattern not primarily for the Christian layman, but for the church and its ministers") is the essential novelty of Schultz's interpretation, and, if granted, it makes Christ's attack upon human learning easy to understand and not too hard to reconcile with a continuing and undisturbed belief in the validity of human reason for the individual. Schultz finds the key in the tracts of 1659. They represent Milton's participation in the current phase of the debate over disestablishment, and, in common with others who would separate church and state, he had to meet the contention that without the incentive of tithes the supply of university-trained ordinands would fail, and with it a worthy learned ministry. The essence of his answer is that however valuable human learning is in itself it is not a necessary qualification for a Christian minister; indeed, school divinity has been a great corrupter of the plain teaching of the scriptures, and has been largely a device by which

a priestly caste sought to bemuse the laity and maintain unlawful privileges; some learning (chiefly of the Bible in its original languages) is desirable in ministers, but it can readily be got at home, without much cost and not requiring the forced and sordid reimbursement of tithes; the universities, purged of "the idle sophistry of monks," could turn to healthier studies.

This, says Schultz, is all that Christ's diatribe against classical philosophy in *Paradise Regained* amounts to: he "refuses to build his church on worldly supports." Satan urges the necessity of Gentile learning in order to refute gentilism (as the defenders of the establishment had urged the necessity of human learning in order to refute heresy); Christ forcefully denies it. But all he is denying is the necessity. "The difference between Satan's position and Christ's is the difference between must and may. Christ himself is not unwilling to be thought learned. 'Think not but that I know these things,' he begins, thereby exculpating the arts; yet he can preach without them and found a Kingdom on scripture alone—'or think I know them not; not therefore am I short of knowing what I ought.' If he neglects the last point, he opens the door to Antichrist and hirelings, who will, in turn, provoke the secular arm to persecute truth. The spiritual minister will be no enemy of good learning, then, if he simply counts it a thing indifferent in the sight of God" (p. 227).

Often the interpretation of poetry is not susceptible of demonstration. In such cases a hypothesis will seem cogent to the extent that, while clashing with nothing which is given, it makes better sense of some aspect of the poem than any other hypothesis. Unless I am misled by my eagerness to see Christ's attack on learning contained and particularized, Schultz's hypothesis makes better sense in this place than any other known to me. But I cannot feel that it meets the other test of cogency quite so well. Does not a strictly ecclesiastical interpretation of the poem conflict, in some degree, with

the sense so many readers have had that Milton was doing everything he could to present Jesus *qua homo*? Indeed, did not his plan of the poem, and of its relation with its predecessor, require such an emphasis?

I who e'rewile the happy Garden  
sung,  
By one mans disobedience lost, now  
sing  
Recover'd Paradise to all mankind,  
By one mans firm obedience fully  
tri'd . . . .

This is not to dispute that Christ's diatribe has an ecclesiastical context (I am much too happy with the consequence of such an interpretation to be willing to question it), but it is to doubt whether he who at the end of the poem "unobserved/ Home to his Mothers house private return'd," not yet ready to begin his ministry, can have been intended as a pattern only for the church, not at all for individual Christians.

In so good and so learned a book as this, one is sorry to meet the view, common enough among scholars less tough-minded than Schultz, that even in 1641-42 Milton was not really a Presbyterian. "On better grounds than his kindness to sectaries we may conclude that he had long been an Independent in principle, or even that he fought for an Independency by the practical expedient of backing Smectymnuus and the most radical effective party" (p. 100). One sees what moves Schultz to write this way; some of the things that would later conflict with Presbyterianism were already present in embryo in the anti-prelatical tracts; but that conflict lay in the future. Now Milton was calling Presbyterianism the "one right discipline" (*Of Reformation*), and insisting that there must be some *jure divino* government of the church and that in fact it was Presbyterianism. *The Reason of Church Government* sets out to prove "That Church Government is prescribed in the Gospel; and that to say otherwise is unsound" and "That Church Government is set down in Holy Scripture; and that to say other-

wise is untrue," and adopts a method that seems to rule out crypto-Congregationalism: "But whether of these two, prelacy or presbytery, can prove itself to be supported by this first and greatest reason, must be the next dispute; wherein this position is to be first laid down, as granted, that I may not follow a chase rather than an argument, that one of these two, and none other, is of God's ordaining" (*Student's Milton*, p. 510).

It is not unusual for *The Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* (1660) to be called Milton's "political utopia," but it is surprising that Schultz should do so. For one thing, the notion of a Milton who would, at the final crisis of the Puritan Revolution, "sequester out of the world into Atlantic and Utopian polities, which never can be drawn into use" runs quite counter to Schultz's own admirable and convincing portrait of the Revolution's indomitable champion. For another, the best protection against this misinterpretation of the *Ready and Easy Way* is Schultz's own method of finding the contemporary context; had he applied his method to Milton's final political pamphlet, as he has to the several discussions of learning, he would have found that, so far from being utopian, it contains hardly a sentence, and certainly no proposal, not immediately derived from the swirling debate of these months on immediate practical expedients to save the foundering Revolution. (A detailed account of the relation between Milton's pamphlet and this background may be found in an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Milton and the Disintegration of the Puritan Cause, 1658-1660*, University of Chicago Library, 1956.)

I have only one further criticism important enough to require mention here. "When [Milton] wrote his organon of progress, *Areopagitica*, his program of free, cooperative research assumed the attainability of absolute truth. Her body had been torn; men possessed her by bits; but given the

freedom to bring their bits together, they might once again behold her entire" (p. 167). But this is not what Milton said. "The sad friends of Truth, such as durst appear, imitating the careful search that Isis made for the mangled body of Osiris, went up and down gathering up limb by limb still as they could find them. We have not yet found them all, lords and commons, nor ever shall do, till her Master's second coming; he shall bring together every joint and member, and shall mold them into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection. Suffer not these licensing prohibitions to stand at every place of opportunity forbidding and disturbing them that continue seeking. . ." (Student's Milton, p. 748). Schultz appears to have collapsed two related but distinct ideas in Milton's argument: the absolute nature of truth, and its progressive revelation. Milton held, indeed, that what had been revealed of divine (absolute) truth could be absolutely known, and that in response to men's renewed efforts more and more of this truth was being revealed; he did not, nor is it easy to see how he could, hold that men could complete the process.

Some who begin this book may feel that Schultz's recondite and highly allusive style is too difficult; it would be a pity if they were thus deterred from finishing what they would then find to be an integrated and very illuminating study, full of wit and learning, offering the promise of a way out of what has seemed a *cul-de-sac* of Milton criticism, and by the way teaching much about late Renaissance habits of mind.

ERNEST SIRLUCK

University of Chicago

*The Inspiration of Scripture. A Study of the Theology of the Seventeenth Century Lutheran Dogmatists.* By ROBERT PREUS. Mankato, Minnesota: Lutheran Synod Book Company, 1955. xix, 216 pp. \$4.50.

One of the major gaps in the literature of historical theology is the lack of adequate monographs concerning

theological developments in the age of Orthodoxy, the period between the formulation of the Reformation confessions and the rise of Rationalism. Otto Ritschl's multi-volume *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus* brings together a large body of material not available elsewhere, but the circumstances under which he wrote it before and after World War I prevented him from doing as thorough a job with the seventeenth century as he had done with the latter half of the sixteenth. What we need are specific studies of individual theologians, of important doctrines, and of significant controversies within and between the confessions and national churches. Helmut Gollwitzer's *Coena Domini* would seem to be a model.

Robert Preus has projected such a study, dealing with the idea of biblical inspiration developed by the Lutheran theologians of the seventeenth century. It is that idea for which these theologians are perhaps best known, and much of Preus' discussion is devoted to some telling criticisms of the way modern historians and theologians have interpreted their teaching. In the main, his presentation is built around the attributes of Scripture in that teaching. After chapters dealing with Scripture as the source of theology, with the identification of Scripture and the Word of God, and with the relation between the activity of the Holy Spirit and that of the authors in the composition of the books of the Bible, he presents, each in turn, the classical attributes—innerrancy, authority, sufficiency, clarity, and efficacy. A conclusion is devoted to several problems like the appropriateness of the Christological analogy for the discussion of Scripture and the consistency between the doctrine of inspiration and other aspects in the theology of the dogmatists.

The book rests upon a great deal of labor in the tedious study of tomes bound in *Schweinsleder*, and it does serve to correct several misunderstandings. The author's own theological position, very close to that of the authors he studies, has prevented him



from raising certain highly pertinent questions; and it has predetermined the answers he provides for others. In addition, the church historian will wish that Preus had considered historical questions more seriously, questions like chronological development, the possibility of Reformed and not merely of Roman Catholic influence, and the importance of implicit philosophical and scientific assumptions.

The relation between revelation and inspiration has once more become a central problem of theology, though in a form different from the one it had. In dealing with it, modern theologians dare not ignore what has gone before. Even those who cannot appropriate the solution of the problem offered here should benefit from the material Preus has collected, although a history of the doctrine of Scripture after the Reformation is still a prime necessity.

JAROSLAV PELIKAN

*The University of Chicago*

*Pia Desideria.* Von PHILIPP JACOB SPENER. Hrsg. von KURT ALAND. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 2., durchgesehene Auflage, 1955. (*Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen*, hrsg. von Kurt Aland, # 170) 91 pp. DM 4.80.

*Quellen zum Wormser Konkordat.* Hrsg. von WOLFGANG FRITZ. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1955 (*Kleine Texte* # 177) 83 pp. DM 6.80.

Blessed is the teacher whose students sit not in the seat of the scornful-of-original-sources. Two recent releases of the distinguished *Kleine Texte* series are of uncommon relevance to church historical interests in America. By general consent we recognize Spener's little *Pia Desideria* as the keystone of Pietism, and the *Worms Concordat* of 1122 as the settlement (to a point!) of the Investiture controversy. But the way some people use the word "Pietist," they'd get quite a jolt to read directly from the gently insistent, doctrinally informed, churchly father of Pietism. And the way people tend to dismiss

the Investiture contest simply as a medieval power struggle, they'd be astonished to discover how inseparable in the midst of this hubbub are *faith* and *order*.

For those who can use them, these texts are pearls of great value at small price. *Pia Desideria*, in German, appears in a revised, textually critical edition collating the nine earliest printings. *Quellen zum Wormser Konkordat*, a recasting of Bernheim's collection, gives 47 Latin excerpts which concentrate chiefly on the events from 1106 to 1122, but include also a glimpse at literary expression preceding and during the showdown, and a kind of epilogue on the effect of the concordat.

ROBERT H. FISCHER

*Chicago Lutheran Seminary  
Maywood*

*La Presqu'île des Caloyers: le Mont-Athos.* By EMMANUEL AMAND DE MENDIETA. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1955. ix, 388 pp. I carte hors-texte. Fr. 240.

The author visited the "Holy Mountain" in 1949. His book is based primarily on the notes he was taking regularly, day by day, during his journey. The author writes well, and tells his story admirably. He went to Mount Athos with a special purpose, on a scholarly errand, to collate and microfilm certain manuscripts of St. Basil. And there he discovered another subject for study, the Holy Mountain itself. It is indeed a peculiar world, this "monastic republic" of Athos,—so rigidly detached from, and so stubbornly opposed to, the "outer world," to the "modern" world of ours. Outsiders are always shocked by this deliberate "backwardness" of Mount Athos. And yet the Holy Mountain has its own thrill, not only because it is "exotic," and the scenery is so magnificent and picturesque. Mount Athos is still a world of Christian adventure. It is a relic of the past. But it is still a living relic, and a relic of a glorious age of faith. This "age of faith" still continues on Mount Athos. People there are strangely indifferent, and even hostile,

to the queries and anxieties, but also to the achievements, of the current age, which they denounce and ignore. But they are keenly alive to the ultimate issues of Christian existence. Their life is, in a sense, a resolute "retreat into eternity." Now, this "retreat" is often misconstrued as a "flight from reality," whereas, in fact, it is intended precisely as a "flight into reality," into the ultimate reality of "life in God." There are indeed "many things" to be done "in the world," even in Christ's name and for Christ's sake, and yet there is but one "good part" which is never to be taken away. The conflict between the two ways, the "way of contemplation" and the "way of service," seems to be permanent in the history of Christendom. The problem of Mount Athos is precisely the problem of "retreat."

In his last chapter the author discusses this problem ("L'ideal mystique et ascétique du caloyer athonite," pp. 308-343). His approach is mainly psychological. He has serious doubts about the validity of the Athonite "ideal." He contends that this "ideal" is grounded in the "Platonic," or rather "Plotinian," dualism, in the "ultra-spiritualist" conception of man, which he imputes to all Greek fathers and ascetical writers. The true "self" of man is identified with his "soul," and his "body" is accordingly neglected. This is a gross simplification. In the Palamite doctrine, which can be regarded as the heart of the Athonite mysticism, the organic unity of man, soul and body, is vigorously emphasized, and the greatest privilege of man, which exalts him above angels, is seen precisely in that he is an "embodied" intelligence. Moreover, the emphasis on the Resurrection, the "*resurrectio carnis*," is specifically characteristic of the Eastern tradition. The ultimate struggle of the monks, their "Unseen Warfare," is obviously not "against the flesh and blood," but against sin, and "against the powers and principalities" of darkness. The author seems to assume that the acute sense of sin is also a sign of "dualism," and he is very uneasy about the "de-

monic" interventions. On the whole, his reaction is a typical reaction of the "modern man."

But the problem of "*contemptio mundi*" is much more complex than he assumes. The author vigorously protests against the total "renunciation" of the world. It implies, he thinks, a refusal to develop one's intelligence, an option for "ignorance." Now, it is true that Athonite monasticism is now in sore need of theological culture. It needs a revival. But the main problem is, what kind of revival is needed? The author thinks in modern terms, he wants to break the seclusion, and open Mount Athos to the fresh air of the common life. He regrets that the attempt to bring "culture" to Mount Athos, made in the XVIII century, by the Patriarch Cyril V of Constantinople, did not succeed. Was it really a loss that "modern systems and methods," i.e. those of Leibniz, Wolf, and Locke, were not implanted on the Holy Mountain, and no "professors from Halle" came to enlighten the Athonite monks (162-164)? The attempt failed at Mount Athos, but a similar attempt succeeded in Russia, and led to a profound disorientation of the Russian religious mind,—it only widened and deepened the gulf between "piety" and "learning."

The present state of Mount Athos is tragic and dramatic. The numbers are steadily decreasing. There were 4,858 inhabitants on the Mountain, of which the large majority were monks (the rest being civil servants and workmen of all kinds), in 1930. In 1950 the number of monks is definitely less than 1,500, and there are but few newcomers. The community is melting down. However, it is not the first crisis in the long history of Athos. The author looks forward to a revival. Yet, this revival, if it has to preserve the values of the past, which the author admits and admires, must be conceived in the spirit of the Fathers, and not in that of the "modern world." In the introductory chapters, the author gives a brief survey of the long and involved history of Athonite monasti-

cism, and describes the present organization of the Holy Mountain, as established and regulated by the "Constitutional Charter" of 1924, and guaranteed by the constitutional law of Greece, 1927. His historical sketch is very informative and well documented. The author is well read in scholarly literature and sufficiently acquainted with the primary sources. The brief section on the "Russian infiltration" to the Holy Mountain, which was the dominant factor in its history between 1830 and 1917, is onesided (54-55). It is unfair to regard it as a clever device of political diplomacy. The migration of Russian monks to Mount Athos was rather a spontaneous movement, not always encouraged by the government. Hundreds of Russian monks felt themselves much more at home outside of Russia. And the impact of Mount Athos on the spiritual life of the Russian Church at home was considerable. This is well stressed in the brief "Preface" to the book, written by Professor Pierre Pascal, of Sorbonne. The reader will be grateful for the excellent "Bibliography," appended to the book.

GEORGES FLOROVSKY

Harvard Divinity School

*Between Heaven and Earth (Holy Mount Monasticism)*. By THEOKLĒTOS DIONYSIATOS. Athens: Astir Publishing House, 1956. Paper. 144 pp. Frontispiece + 3 colored plates. Illustrated. (In Greek)

*Between Heaven and Earth (Holy Mount Monasticism)* is richly illustrated by the artists Phōtios Kontoglou and Rallēs Kopsidēs and was written by the Mount Athos Monk Theoklētos Dionysiatos at the request of his abbot, Archimandrite Gabriel, as a sort of *Apologia pro Vita Monastica*. It is actually much more than that. Written in beautiful Greek in the form of a dramatic dialogue (and in certain respects more interesting than the Platonic prototype), this unusual work has for its scene a monastery on Mount Athos where vivid discussions take place concerning Byzantine monasticism. The principal

persons of the dialogue are a monastic narrator, the Gerōn Theolēptos, the monk Chrysostomos, a theologian (a layman), a lawyer, an Erēmītēs, a novice monk, Nikolaos, and an abbot, Archimandrite Eusebios.

In brilliant and interesting fashion, the dialogue carries us through such topics as the difference between secular and monastic beliefs, the Monk and God, physical beauty and spiritual beauty, the formulation of a definition of Faith, monasticism and society, an interpretation of the history of monasticism on Mount Athos in relation to history, the meaning of Mount Athos, the relation between the monasticism of Athos and the monasticism of the Church of the earliest ages, a detailed discussion of Dionysius the Areopagite, his works, their genuineness and relation to Eastern mysticism and Neoplatonism, monasticism and mysticism, a discussion of mysticism with emphasis on the fourteenth century, the century of Eastern mysticism *par excellence*, including Palamas, Gregory of Sinai, Theolēptos of Philadelphia, Ignatios and Kallistos of Xanthopoulai, Nikēphoros Kallistos, Nikēphoros Hēsychastēs, Philotheos the Patriarch, Maximos of Kausokalibitos and numerous others.

This work does a beautiful job of presenting the history and development of Eastern monasticism from the fourth to the fourteenth centuries A.D., and from the fourteenth century to the present day, not in the form of a sterile scholarly work, but in the form of a dramatic dialogue which captures the reader's attention and manages to convey some of the religious mysticism which it so brilliantly describes.

JOHN E. REXINE

Brandeis University.

*A History of Training for the Ministry of the Church of England, 1800-1874*, by F. W. B. BULLOCK. St. Leonards-on-Sea, Eng.: Budd & Gillatt, 1955. 164 pp. 20 shillings.

Dr. Bullock, who is Canon Emeritus of Truro Cathedral, has provided a lively and informative chronicle of

theological training in the Church of England. While he concentrates on the period from 1800 to 1874, he gives a brief but excellent survey of the period from 1539 to 1799, and, in an appendix, adds some notes on training in the Anglican Communion outside England and Wales.

The book is especially valuable because the author has not only recounted the history of the institutions, and characterized some of the general types of theological training; but he has given considerable attention to the content of theological study, to curricula, examinations, and standards for ordination. The discussion in the Church of adequate theological preparation for the pastorate or priesthood is analyzed with acute insight; and is especially valuable because the author does not write simply for edification but with a concern to bring out the central issues.

Throughout nearly the entire period the question of adequacy and significance of the university education at Oxford and Cambridge, and the question of whether this needs to be supplemented through theological seminaries are to the fore. The struggle is not only between various ecclesiastical and theological forces but it involves the nature of the ministry and the significance of "learning" as preparation for it. Diocesan theological colleges were started in part to provide practical pastoral training in addition to university education; and they were in part centers for the consolidation of the Tractarian movement. Some church statesmen, like Charles Hebert, in 1853, argued that while theological colleges were necessary to supplement the classical course, "We look forward to the time when, through the more complete adaptation of the universities to the wants of the nation, the bishops will be able, as they are desirous, to require every candidate for Holy Orders to have passed through a course of study, either at the ancient universities, or at . . . Durham." (pp. 88-9).

The reflection which the entire history prompts is that there has been a continual struggle even in the Angli-

can church to provide a barely adequate training which will involve both a grasp of the foundations of liberal learning, and the special training required for the pastor, preacher, and priest in the parish. The case for an adequately educated clergy has had to be argued over and over, and supported through experience of the dire consequences of failing to provide it. Some of the eloquent and discerning interpretations of the meaning of theological education quoted here should carry weight today.

DANIEL D. WILLIAMS  
*Union Theological Seminary*  
*New York City*

*The Critical Years.* By CLARA O. LOVELAND. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1956. 311 pp. \$3.50.

This study really is not, as the jacket claims, the first authentic and detailed account of the years of conflict and compromise from 1780-1789, when the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was unified and organized. The period is by no means "unknown"; a large body of documentation has long existed in Bishop William White's *Memoirs*, and the documentary collections gathered by Bishop William Stevens Perry and Francis Lister Hawks (especially, Perry's *Historical Notes and Documents*). Documents and essays on the general and state conventions have appeared over many years in the *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*. This new, well organized, and lucidly written study is based largely upon these sources, together with many private letters, sermons, and controversial pamphlets, biographies, records of state and general conventions, newspapers, general and diocesan histories, and background literature.

The real contribution that the author has made to Episcopal Church historiography is her superior organization and interpretation of this huge body of material. First she clearly indicates the threats to unity in the want of uniformity, differences of churchmanship, and political divisions of the Episcopal churches in the Colonial

and Revolutionary periods, and the consequent necessity of a radically new form of church government that would satisfy the conflicting groups and yet really work. The study is organized around certain topics that probably have never before been so clearly stated.

The first is Maryland's effort to establish continuity with the Church of England in orders and in the Prayer Book. The second is William White's democratic and federal plan of organization, based upon John Locke's theory of government. The third is Connecticut's insistence, under the inspiration of Samuel Seabury, upon the necessity of the episcopate, of orthodox doctrine, and of the sacramental character of the Holy Communion. These factors in the struggle to attain unity, harmony, and uniformity, sprang from the circumstances of the Church's development in the Southern, Middle, and New England Colonies respectively.

The author sympathetically stresses the roles of divergent leaders in producing eventual harmony from a tense and dangerous situation that might have produced a bitter sectional schism. One part was that of the Rev. Samuel Parker of Boston as a mediator between the episcopal- and federal-minded Churchmen. It is made clear that the work of his Boston group told heavily in favor of unity through a uniform liturgy. The author refers, although perhaps not at adequate length, to the contribution of Thomas B. Chandler and the clergy of New York and New Jersey, in preventing radical changes in the Prayer Book.

The outcome was not only a new but fundamentally conservative Prayer Book, but also a new departure in Anglican Church polity, based upon the parish as the basic unit, rather than the diocese, as in England. Other results were a purely ecclesiastical episcopate of equal bishops, lay representation in every level of church government from parish to General Convention, and the unique American institution of the Standing Committee partly composed of laymen. Yet, the

study clearly demonstrates, the American Church retains the three characteristic notes of the Church of England: continuity with Apostolic and Catholic tradition, unity, and diversity of interpretation and practice.

This volume may well become the standard study of this period. One of its most valuable features for future scholars is the complete catalog of letters used, that passed between the chief actors in those stormy years, with their locations. There is an adequate index, and the bibliography is not only impressively extensive, but also well classified.

NELSON R. BURR.

*Library of Congress.*

*Stephen T. Badin. Priest in the Wilderness.* By J. HERMAN SCHAUINGER. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956. xiv, 317 pp. \$7.50.

Since 1949 Professor Schauinger of the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul has published three well documented studies on prominent Catholic figures of the early national period. The subject of his first biography was William Gaston, who died in 1844 as an associate justice of the supreme court of North Carolina: the second was a life of Benedict J. Flaget, S.S., first Bishop of Bardstow, rather unhappily entitled *Cathedrals in the Wilderness* (1952); and now he has written the life of Flaget's Kentucky contemporary, the French-born Stephen Theodore Badin. Like its two predecessors this biography is based for the most part on hitherto unpublished sources, principally about 120 letters of Badin between 1796 and 1851, to be found in the rich manuscript collections at the University of Notre Dame (frequently referred to here as Notre Dame University) and in the archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. Mr. Schauinger has, then, made a real contribution, and the thoroughness of his research would seem to leave little to be desired. The volume contains seven pages of illustrations (unlisted in the contents), three appendices which reprint a controversial will of Thomas Howard of Nelson



County, Kentucky, Badin's own will, and a prayer composed by him, a classified bibliography, and an adequate index. The price, incidentally, would seem to be abnormally high for the size of the book.

Badin was born in the city of Orleans in 1768, came to the United States as a seminarian in March, 1792, became the first Catholic priest ordained in this country (May 25, 1793), arrived in Lexington, Kentucky, the following November, and there opened a missionary career that was to endure for sixty years until his death in Cincinnati on April 19, 1853, at the age of eighty-five. For more than a half century he traveled thousands of miles by foot, horseback, and boat through large sections of the Middle West, hunting out stray Catholic families, administering the sacraments, catechizing the children, buying huge tracts of land for future church purposes, and managing to get into—and out of—an uncommon number of controversies with Protestant ministers, his own bishop and fellow priests, and with members of the Catholic laity. It was a full and fruitful life, surely, and one that in the long view reflected high credit on Badin's religious zeal, steadfast purpose in the face of frightful odds, and his general foresight, shrewdness, and indefatigable labors. True, he was not always an easy man to get along with, and his defects are set down here—as in his feuds with the Dominicans and with Bishop Flagnet—with a sensible candor and balance which inspire confidence in the author's integrity as an historian.

To the present reviewer Mr. Schauinger's book has only one serious defect, namely, its failure to make the story come alive. There were dramatic episodes in Badin's life which might well have highlighted the narrative, but the pace never seems to quicken, and at times it slows almost to a standstill by excessively long quotations on tangled disputes over property rights (pp. 128-130; 175-182). Even Jenny Lind's concert in Cincinnati, recorded in Badin's last extant letter of April 22, 1851, to

Archbishop Purcell (p. 283) strikes no spark! There is a failure, too, to identify properly the persons who enter the story, e.g., John Mullanphy (pp. 75, 93), destined to become one of the earliest Catholic philanthropists, and Angelo Inglesi (pp. 97, 207) who flits in and out without a word of background to the reader about this clerical scamp. Among the minor inaccuracies the following were noted. The Catholic population of the United States was closer to 35,000 in 1790 than to 17,000 (p. 3); Dom Urbain Guillet, the Trappist, was not an abbot (p. 91); it is odd to read of those who came to confession to Badin in terms of "one of his penitents or even one of his sinners" (p. 105) since 'penitent' usually presupposes a sinner; it was *The Protestant* not *The Protestant Vindicator* (p. 258) that heralded the nativist movement in 1830; one wonders what an Italian would make out of the French national church in Rome being rendered as "St. Luigi di Francesi" (p. 209); France expelled the Jesuits from its North American possessions in 1763, not 1764 (p. 216); the terms 'embassy' and 'ambassador' (pp. 194, 201) are misnomers in this context when 'legation' and 'minister' were the terms in use; for 'parishioner's' read 'parishioners' (p. 21); for 'on' read 'in' (p. 91); a plural verb is needed on page 133, line 16; for 'Ottowa' read 'Ottawa' (p. 240); and there is carelessness about the accents in foreign languages, e.g., the word 'abbé' rarely being given its accent. In the bibliography one misses Peter Guilday's two volumes on *The Life and Times of John England, First Bishop of Charleston, 1786-1842* (New York, 1927) and Annabelle M. Melville's *John Carroll of Baltimore* (New York, 1955); likewise in the bibliography the opening date of Billington's well known work is 1800, not 1809 (p. 302).

These criticisms are not meant to convey the impression that the volume on the whole has been carelessly done. On the contrary, it is a thorough and workmanlike job, and we can be grateful to Professor Schauinger for doing

here for Badin what he had previously done for Gaston and Flaget, namely, to make the life histories of these pioneer Catholic figures better known to the reading public.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS  
*The Catholic University of America.*

*Christian Perfection and American Methodism. The Wesleyan Doctrine—Its Development and Deviations.*

By JOHN L. PETERS. New York and Nashville: The Abingdon Press, 1956. 252 pp. \$4.00.

Those to whom the language of theology seems an unknown tongue will welcome this straightforward account of Methodist perfectionism. John L. Peters, who forsook an early career as a minister and youth leader in the Church of the Nazarene to earn a doctorate at Yale, is now a distinguished Methodist clergyman and head of World Neighbors, Incorporated. His concluding statement argues seriously the relevance for modern theology of Wesley's "high doctrine of grace," which rejects both liberalism's denial of man's depravity and neo-orthodoxy's despair on account of it.

The most significant portion of this volume is the well-nigh definitive summary of the views of Wesley and Fletcher, occupying over one half of the space. The author makes full use of the insights in Harold Lindstrom's recent study, for which the Methodist founder's sermons provided the decisive evidence. He adds on his own part the fruits of an exhaustive analysis of Wesley's journals and letters.

The revivals of 1759-1762, Dr. Peters concludes, brought to an end the Epworth preacher's long reluctance to center his perfectionist doctrines in "an instantaneous act of the Holy Spirit, receivable *now* and by faith." Although a fascinating essay in the appendix leaves more than ever open the question of whether Wesley believed or professed that he enjoyed this "second blessing", the other portions of the book should remove all doubt that he made the attainment of it the chief burden of his preaching

and instruction to others. Both Wesley and his nineteenth-century admirers, however, created semantic problems by confounding the terms Christian perfection and entire sanctification. The author believes that the former ought to denote the high and ever-receding goal of spiritual aspiration, the latter the crucial experience by which the love of God comes to reign supreme in the Christian's heart and impel him onward toward that goal. Wesley used the phrases interchangeably in later life. He never ceased to emphasize, however, the gradual work of God's grace which must both precede and follow the instantaneous reception of "perfect love", nor to ground the quest for holiness in the disciplined fellowship of the church.

The chapters on the extension of this doctrine to America and its modification here are less definitive, perhaps, but they are exceedingly provocative. Peters here serves as a pioneer, clearing the woods rather than sifting fine soil. Christian perfection, he demonstrates amply, suffered partial eclipse during the first fifty years of Methodist evangelism in the New World. The earliest circuit-riders spent most of their energies bridling Calvinism and taming the wilderness. After 1836, however, Phoebe Palmer's "New York Tuesday Meeting for the Promotion of Holiness" and a Boston monthly, *The Guide to Holiness*, spearheaded a remarkably successful campaign to restore the founder's quest to a central place in Wesleyan religion. Nathan Bangs, Bishop Leonidas Hamline and other prominent officials heartily supported it.

From 1852 forward, Dr. Peters believes, this crusade slowly lost ground, a conclusion which William Warren Sweet and Wade Crawford Barclay have expressed earlier. The holiness advocates became after this date, so the argument runs, a divisive "party" of radicals, whom responsible leaders quite properly feared for the amendments they made to Wesley's doctrine and for their drift toward schism. The author's contribution to this view—that Mrs. Palmer's admirers stressed

the crisis of experience almost to the exclusion of growth in grace, discipline and the subjection of the "sanctified" to temptation and human frailty, and that they regarded the second blessing as "absolutely necessary for salvation here and hereafter"—seems to this writer unconvincing. It does not find validation in the holiness literature of the period, only insignificant fragments of which Dr. Peters cites. The theologian, William Burt Pope, generously praised for presenting Wesley's views in "undistorted miniature", actually differed very little in his emphasis upon these points from William Jones, Dougan Clark and Mark Guy Pearse, all of whom wrote for the holiness press. When, in fact, as Peters himself points out, responsible Methodists attacked the second blessing theory, they freely acknowledged that they were deviating from Wesley's views.

Occasional errors of fact betray the shallow basis of this interpretation. *The Methodist Quarterly Review*, for example, *did* carry serious articles on holiness between 1853 and 1861, notably an enthusiastic review of Jesse T. Peck's *Central Idea of Christianity*, a book which helped to make its author a bishop (see p. 124). Richard Wheatley's *Life and Letters of Phoebe Palmer*, which Dr. Peters elsewhere cites, and Henry B. Ridgeway's *Life of Alfred Cookman*, which he neglected, amply contradict the almost unannotated summary of the "decline" of interest in holiness between 1855 and 1865 (132-133). The account of the postwar revival, under the auspices of the National Association for the Promotion of Holiness (pp. 134-135), is similarly awry. Bishop Hamline was dead, but Matthew Simpson, very much alive, participated enthusiastically in the first three "national" gatherings. John S. Inskip, the president, was a prominent New York City pastor. He did not become an evangelist until 1869, when Bishop E. R. Ames helped launch Inskip's new career by taking him along as the preacher to several Western Conferences.

Most of these errors reflect, no doubt, the exploratory nature of Dr.

Peters' research. We would feel happier about them, however, were the footnotes in this portion of the volume more complete and accurate, especially on crucial points. For example, between pages 138 and 143, seventeen direct quotations appear without information as to their source. The omission of dates from citations of nineteenth century periodical articles, as well as from those of the letters and journals of Wesley, Fletcher and others, is an unnecessary nuisance, if nothing more.

It should be said, however, in defense of this last half of the book, that its shortcomings reflect in part the blindspots common to most American church historiography. We have studied our religious development through the eyes of the learned and the liberal and neglected the magazines, biographies and devotional literature which the people read. Under the influence of the recent modernist-fundamentalist controversy, we have nearly buried the memory of the long association between earnest piety and social work and concern. Our preference for limited studies confined to one denomination obscures the fact that the most significant currents in popular religion sweep across many sects and reflect the social strivings of an age. And, finally, we find it quite impossible to avoid prejudice against ideas and practices now characteristic of the despised "small sects," however responsible and progressive may have been their nineteenth century advocates.

TIMOTHY L. SMITH  
*Eastern Nazarene College*

*The Religious Press in the South Atlantic States, 1802-1865: An Annotated Bibliography with Historical Introduction and Notes.* By HENRY SMITH STROUPE. ("Historical Papers of the Trinity College Historical Society," Series XXXII.) Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1956. 172 pp. \$4.50.

This is a reference volume worthy of the bibliographical shelf of any library.

The "South Atlantic States" involved are Virginia, North and South

Carolina, Georgia, Florida and West Virginia (to 1861). Here, from 1802 to 1865—the former date being that of the appearance of the first religious periodical in the region, the latter that of the close of the Civil War, which was a natural “turning point” in the history of the religious press of the area — 159 religious journals are known to have been published, another nine “proposed” only. Average life of the 159 to 1865 was five years and seven months. Thus this study brings to light some 860 volumes of historical material published mainly at monthly and weekly intervals contemporary to the events involved. These publications were the product of fourteen denominations, Baptists being responsible for one third of the titles; Presbyterians and Methodists sharing another third; other groups in relative order of productivity being Disciples, Episcopalians, Universalists, Roman Catholics, Spiritualists, Christadelphians, Lutherans, Unitarians, Christians, Quakers, and United Brethren.

The “Historical Introduction” is brief (35 pages). It shows that to 1830 South Atlantic religious editors, like those in the North, sought chiefly to extend the gains of the Great Revivals of the early 1800’s “in missionary activity, in the founding of academies, colleges and seminaries, and in the establishment of philanthropic organizations.” In the 1830’s sectarian issues pushed to the fore, Presbyterian journals taking Old and New School sides; Baptist journals stands for or against missionary organizations (giving rise to Primitive and Old Landmark groups); Disciple journals stands for or against the views of Campbell and Thomas (Christadelphian). In the 1840’s slavery became the critical issue, leading to a fairly united voice against the northern religious press and the development of the prosperous “southern” press in the 1850’s. Then 1860 to 1865 raised the questions of secession and war. Concertedly “every editor of religious periodicals in the South Atlantic States . . . opposed secession until it became a reality”; but once the union was divided these editors gave strong support to the war.

No startling conclusion is reached, but it is evident that the 800 volumes made accessible by this study hold infinite untapped detail on the attitude of fourteen denominations toward the issues involved.

The extended “Annotated Bibliography” (pp. 40-138) is the heart of this work. Here each journal is described in alphabetical order according to a formula which includes title (with variations), place of publication, date of first and last issues, periodicity, format, editor (with some detail on life when known), publisher or proprietor, denomination, circulation, AND MOST IMPORTANT OF ALL, LOCATIONS OF EXTANT FILES. All but 35 of the publications described are located in part or full in some library. Three appendices (pp. 139-159) list all titles chronologically, denominationally, and geographically; and there is an index of editors and publishers.

Several criticisms may be offered. Specialized historians will feel that minority groups have been slighted, for little point is made either in introduction or bibliographical notes of such developments as the Trinitarian wing within Universalism, the “Protestant” wing within Methodism, the Evangelical wing within the Episcopalians, etc.—all of which are clearly evidenced in southern journals of the time. Specialized bibliographers will express surprise at some omissions. The editor of the *Lay-Man’s Magazine* who is said to have “completely concealed” (p. 5) his identity was actually Benjamin Allen. James Muir is not given as editor of the *Monthly Visitant*; nor Frederick Dalcho as projector and early editor of the *Gospel Messenger*; nor Martin Luther Hurlbut as associated with *Unitarian Defendant*; nor Austin Dickinson as the one who issued the original prospectus for the *Family Visitor*. Some dates could be more accurate: the *Evangelical Museum* actually continued to December 1828; the *Liberalist* began February 3, 1827 (not 1826) and continued at Wilmington until March 1830 when it planned to move to Pawtucket, R. I.; and actual publication dates of the

*Star of the South* were June 1826 to April 1827. The location symbol PCA is obsolete, this collection now being housed at Colgate-Rochester under the symbol NRAB. The list of "proposed" publications should have included at least three others: the *North Carolina Evangelical Intelligencer* (Hillsborough, N. C., 1821); the *Southern Preacher* (Fayetteville, N. C., 1828); and the *Methodist Correspondent* (which planned a sixth volume for Wheeling, W. Va., 1836). Still this is a worthy work. These shortcomings only show that the bibliographer's work is never finished. Others can always add fine points from their specialized research.

GAYLORD P. ALBAUGH  
*Divinity School*  
*McMaster University*

*Elias Hicks, Quaker Liberal.* By BLISS FORBUSH. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956. 355 pp. \$5.50.

Elias Hicks, who had at the age of seventy wistfully announced that his lifework of itinerant Quaker ministry was quietly closing, found himself in the next ten years the most controversial figure of Quakerism. The "Hicksite Separation" of 1828 has been continued to the present day in the divided organizations and doctrinal warfare between the evangelical Quakers of the Five Years Meeting and the liberals of the Friends General Conference, in most parts of America. This fine biography by the headmaster of the Friends School in Baltimore is the first life of Hicks since 1910, and the first to clothe the dry bones with manuscript material, much of which was discovered at Hicks' Long Island farm and Meeting-House during preparation for this volume. Bliss Forbush writes in a vigorous, eye-witness style, setting the personal history against the political and social history of the nation, (despite having less depth of understanding in the intellectual movements in America from Edwards to Emerson). Elias Hicks lived through the American Revolution, the war against the Tripoli pirates, the Embargo and the War of 1812, and also

through the era of Deism, Federalism and the folk-ism of Jackson; the Quakers as a group were affected by all these. Hicks himself is shown in contact with frontier life on visits ranging progressively westward from Vermont to the Ohio valley.

Like John Woolman, Hicks lived in a day when the problems of Quakerism and of America could be approached on a personal basis. Hicks too supported himself, mainly by farming, between journeys to visit groups for whom he felt responsibility or concern, totalling over 38,000 miles in 64 trips, and averaging 2 months a year on the road for fifty years. His first concern was to strengthen local Quaker meetings. But the moral aloofness of Quakers from much social life at this period was rarely a physical withdrawal like the Mennonites'. Hicks worked to build "Select" Friends Schools for Quakers only, and helped disown Friends who "married out of Meeting." Yet he preached and visited week after week in the churches of Baptists and Methodists and the cabins of churchless frontiersmen. Hicks' massive reception in the State Houses of Albany and Trenton reminds one of the acclaim for George Whitefield. But Hicks was above all a moralist, bringing "to the careless, the unguarded and the refractory, caution and rebuke" (p. 130).

The "calm, dignified, self-possessed" but austere personality of Hicks is shown by Forbush as a factor in the controversy among Quakers over evangelicalism. In controversy Hicks could be harsh, and often over-stated his case, saying Confucius was as inspired as the Bible and that "the Bible had done more harm than good." Many letters by his friends contain tactful warnings of imminent strife; others wrote openly to Hicks about his "censoriousness, . . . not only against the doctrines, but those who had embraced them." (p. 139). Hicks indeed accepted personal attacks with great tenderness, and though he was opaque to the efforts of evangelical friends such as Grellet, Hicks tried to keep friendship and hospitality for those who sought to show him his theological failings.



Yet Hicks maintained the uncompromising morality of the "Tory radical," the farmer-reformer.

Elias Hicks' warfare against evil included minor skirmishes: to him, the public laws for the sabbath and Thanksgiving linked too much the church and state. Hicks rural conservatism distrusted money, bigness and power: Hicks opposed the Erie Canal, built for profit where God intended no river. Though Hicks often preached to Indians and negroes, he saw the covetous hands of the "hireling" clergy behind all Bible-societies, Mission Boards and benevolent organizations; (here Hicks is closer in spirit to the frontier Baptists than to the religious "laissez-faire" of modern "Hicksites"). But for Hicks, as for Woolman, the paramount issue was slavery. Hicks hoped to set up a national boycott of all products of slave labor:—even on his deathbed, speechless, he pushed aside a cotton quilt. He had spoken of all who shared complicity in slave-owning as thieves and murderers. This made for Hicks some bitter enemies, especially among the richer Philadelphia Quakers. He was the proto-abolitionist:—it would be interesting to know more fully the relationship of Hicks to Benjamin Lundy, and also to the "Anti-Slavery Friends" of Indiana, who were theologically orthodox and yet were driven out to form their own "Yearly Meeting."

The separation in Quakerism came officially over theology, after 25 years of growing cleavage: the issue came first to Hicks' own New York area over the disownment of Hannah Barnard for unitarianism in 1801. The decisive break came in Philadelphia in 1827, after ten years of tense incidents. Many issues were actually involved besides theology: slavery and the personality of Hicks. The differences in the Quaker way of life between country, city and new frontier were reflected in the alignment of city and new-frontier Friends with evangelicalism: the settled and isolated rural Quaker villages were "liberal" or "Hicksite." But issues are cross-linked: Hicks shares outlooks with the frontier, and with the "New Lights" in England.

(Forbush's work needs to be carried further in analyzing the meaning of "New Light" and "Inner Light" at this period). Bliss Forbush puts undue weight upon isolated incidents, especially those caused by visitors from England, which provided the occasions but not the issues and pressures.

The theological issues then treated as crucial are not easy to evaluate now. The evangelical Friends shared the ideas which were then sweeping through all English-speaking Protestantism. The personal witness and experience behind this theology eluded Elias Hicks—and Bliss Forbush only partly grasps it. Hicks' own beliefs are harder still to pin down in modern contexts. He came late in life to insist that "we *cannot*, and therefore *are* not bound to believe what we cannot comprehend," (p. 219) and that Christianity is "a rational faith, for reason is the recipient of revelation" (p. 231). But he had earlier attacked Deism and Natural Religion, and the non-Quaker books Forbush notes him to have read were Swedenborg and Mosheim, not the Deists. In showing that Hicks always focussed on the Inner Light of God within each man, Forbush too easily interprets this in modern liberal terms as "the certainty that there were hidden depths of personality which connect . . . with the Ultimate Reality" (p. xiv). Forbush does not show how far Hicks felt the Inner Light as the intrusion of God into the corrupted lives of men, an inward Presence which must be obeyed. Thus too, though Hicks attacked the authority of the Bible in contrast to the Spirit within, the modern warrior against fundamentalism must concede that Hicks believed in miracles and the Virgin Birth precisely because of God's power to intervene in human lives. Hicks rejected the Trinity as a non-Biblical term, since Calvinist theologians of the day verged on Tri-theism. But in calling Jesus "Son of God, Mediator, and Lord from Heaven," Hicks was probably not simply using "many traditional theological phrases" (p. 176). The clearest issue in the conflict of 1828 is that between the Pietists and the Moralists. The ethical challenge of Elias Hicks, at

any rate, was of a searching depth and inwardness.

Bliss Forbush has provided materials which all students of Quaker history have wanted, and have never before had access to. In his humility, Forbush may have leaned more than he needed upon the interpretations of Rufus Jones and Elbert Russell, the authors of the standard histories of Quakerism as a whole. A careful and scholarly concern for chronological sequence has led to rather fragmentary chapters, giving the materials rather than the threads of development; more links and comparisons would have made clearer the growth of Hicks' thinking. As a final note, one wishes that at this time when Quakers are groping towards re-union despite deep awareness of divisive issues, Forbush might not have felt out of loyalty that "the story of Elias Hicks obviously means a full presentation of the liberal point of view" (p. xiii). Yet Bliss Forbush's deep fairness and generosity of spirit and his historical faithfulness will make this book fruitful in understanding, even to the embattled Quaker evangelical, and also to the general reader concerned about Quakerism in America.

HUGH BARBOUR

Earlham College

*Edward Bellamy: Selected Writings on Religion and Society.* Edited, with an Introduction by JOSEPH SCHIFFMAN. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1955. 139 pp. 75 cents.

"It is a religion most emphatically," Edward Bellamy wrote a pastor in *Talks on Nationalism*, "but it is not a new religion . . . It is Christ's doctrine of the duty of loving one's neighbor as one's self, applied to the reorganization of industry." Bellamy's utopianism, as this suggests, had strong religious overtones. This strain in his social thought is represented in the selections Joseph Schiffman has assembled from *Looking Backward*, *Equality*, *Dr. Heidenhoff's Process* (an early, neglected novel), and from hitherto unpublished essays and letters. One of these, "The Religion of Solidarity," written as early as 1874, reveals the striking sim-

ilarities between Bellamy's Social Gospel sympathies of the 1880s and the Transcendentalism of Emerson and the senior Henry James.

The editor has furnished an excellent introduction, chronology, and selective bibliography. For the general reader, however, there is either too much or too little of *Looking Backward*. Nearly half the text is devoted to selections from this novel, and the pieces from less well-known works are sometimes limited to tantalizing snippets. The complete text of *Looking Backward* would have made this the most useful Bellamy paperback I know; as it stands, we would have welcomed longer selections from Bellamy's writings which our age has forgotten.

ALBERT E. STONE, JR.

Yale University

*Three Archbishops of Milwaukee, Michael Heiss (1818-1890), Frederick Katzer (1844-1903), Sebastian Messmer (1847-1930)* by the REVEREND BENJAMIN J. BLIED, Ph.D. Milwaukee, 1955. 160 pp. \$4.00. (Privately printed).

In this all too brief delineation of the three Archbishops of Milwaukee during the last decade of the nineteenth and the first three decades of the twentieth century the Reverend Benjamin Blied has begun a long needed reparation of the neglect of the history of the German prelates in the United States. Because of the large number of prelates of Irish extraction in the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States and the large bodies of Catholics of Irish descent in the more populous centers of the country there has been a tendency to underplay the contribution of other national groups to the Catholic organization. There have been large numbers of German Catholic immigrants in New York, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and St. Louis, but the early leadership among the German clergy in the United States was furnished for the most part by the Archbishops of Milwaukee. Of the first of these, Archbishop John Martin Henni, the forthcoming biography by Dr. Peter Leo Johnson will

be most welcome. Father Blied has chosen to study Henni's successors and has approached their story with a mild German partisanship which is generally refreshing. All three, Michael Heiss, Frederick Katzer, and Sebastian Messmer, were strong characters who brought to the American scene minds formed for the most part in the Catholic tradition of the German Rhineland. Few non-German American Catholics saw in the public schools a Hegelian philosophy as Heiss saw it. On the contrary, Archbishop John Ireland, who is cast more or less as the villain in the story, had little sympathy with the German Catholic approach to the Catholic school question. Father Blied scarcely does justice to the viewpoint of Ireland and the other American bishops who did not have the financial means to build separate Catholic schools for their impoverished immigrants or to the desires of the Americanizers in the hierarchy to bring their urban flocks out of the ghettos where they were suffering social and economic ostracism. Continental Catholicism was indeed fighting against the irreligion of the French Revolution and these German Archbishops, raised in that Continental tradition, were justly alarmed when they saw the same irreligion in America. But for most American Catholics the United States was a new scene and presented a different problem. It is to be hoped that Father Blied will tell us more of the German side of the argument, since we have recently received studies from a different viewpoint in the recent biographies of Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland and Archbishop Keane.

THOMAS T. McAVOY, C.S.C.

*University of Notre Dame*

*Goshen College, 1894-1954—A Venture in Christian Higher Education.*  
By JOHN UMBLE. Scottdale, Penn.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1955. 284 pp., 67 photos. \$3.00.

Professor John Umble has the advantage of long association with Goshen College for writing its history. As student and teacher, his relationship with the school has covered thirty-two of its sixty years of history in-

dicated by the title of the book. While the author carries a bias in favor of the college in its controversy with the constituency of the Mennonite Church, which supports the college, he is not unsympathetic nor lacking in understanding of the position of the critics of the school. He notes that the leadership of the college has not always been above reproach, especially in its communication of attitude.

Goshen College had its beginning in Elkhart, Indiana, as a private, non-denominational school in the year 1894. It was for the first six years of its history known as "The Elkhart Institute of Science, Industry, and the Arts." An unfavorable building site and growth of the normal type of school dictated the removal of the school to its present location about ten miles southeast at Goshen, Indiana. This occurred in 1903 and since that time the school has been known by its present name. It has also been continuously, except in its very earliest period as the Elkhart Institute, under the supervision of the Mennonite Board of Education. This relationship has not always been harmonious. Especially was this true from the years 1913 until 1924.

Of this unhappy situation, Professor Umble writes: "To ascribe all the difficulty between the College and its constituency to a cultural lag would be to attempt an over-simplification of the problem" (pp. 109ff.). Nevertheless, this viewpoint dominates the framework of the book. It becomes the story of every minority religious (and sometimes immigrant) group coming to America, defending what it believes in opposition to the complexity of a cultural pattern foreign to itself.

The basic problem involved in the dispute was the anabaptist belief in separation from the world. The constituency of the Church feared such contacts as the students had in athletic meetings, musical organization tours and even such religious conferences as those held by more interdenominational groups such as the Y.M.C.A. Of special interest is the account of the continuing dispute over the garb to be worn.

The leaders of the college felt that the genius of anabaptism lay deeper than the type of clothing to be worn. As such, the program of the college has rather emphasized in a creative fashion the Church's position on war and peace and service to fellowmen. Its motto, "Culture for Service," has been dramatized by notable endeavors in education related to Civilian Public Service Camps, sponsorship of foreign students on the campus, the cause of peace, and missionary service.

After the school had been closed for one year (1923-1924), there opened a new era, marked by growing harmony, under the presidencies of S. C. Yoder (1924-1940) and Ernest Miller (1940-1954). Greater concern for clear communication to the Church as to what the college stood for was shown. Such policies as placing at the disposal of the Church the facilities of the college have expressed this concern and done so effectively.

This is not to say that the early administrations of Byers, Hartzler, and their successors prior to 1923 were negative. The author is careful to point out that these men did build sufficient foundations. Theirs was the work of bringing the problem of acculturation into sharper focus even when they did so rather unconsciously. Their deep dedication to the work has justified their efforts.

Goshen College, around its motto, "Culture for Service," sees its program in a two-point fashion. First, the essence of Christianity is discipleship. Secondly, life thus committed cannot be separated into secular and nonsecular compartments.

Professor Umble's book is basically written for the constituency of Goshen College. His failure to state the geographic location of other Mennonite schools such as Hesston and Bluffton indicates this purpose but this omission also makes it more difficult for the general reader. With this qualification, the book is a fine study that portrays both a common problem of church-related colleges and the unique problems and program of Goshen College.

The book includes in its title, "A Venture in Christian Higher Educa-

tion." Such it is. Goshen holds course with numerous institutions dedicated to a similar quest in American history. Many have failed. That Goshen and other schools of like character have continued indicates that at least down to the present time, the venture has not been without success. Goshen's success is in no small part due to at least two factors. First, in the process of acculturation, Goshen was able to distinguish between the basic character of its anabaptist tradition and mere resistance to change which appeared to be faithful to that tradition but was rather a betrayal. Secondly, Goshen has attempted to articulate its philosophy of education through self-examination by such means as self-study programs (e.g. p. 190). Not all educators will agree that this is a sufficient statement. It is not likely that the leaders of education at Goshen will claim this to be the final word. But to be aware of the need for such self-consciousness is salutary. It may be hoped with some degree of certainty that the "Venture in Christian Higher Education" will continue to prosper as it sees itself basically as adventure.

EMMET EKLUND

*A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland.* By WILLIAM D. MAXWELL. London: Oxford University Press, 1955. 190 pp. 15s.

Fifteen centuries of Scottish worship are here recorded, from the time of Ninian's apostolic labors to the author's own recent ministry at Whitekirk and Tynninghame. Yet the book is a slender volume, comprising the Baird Lectures for 1953. As such, it lacks some of the careful proportions of Maxwell's *Outline of Christian Worship* (1936) and the meticulous scholarship of his *John Knox's Geneva Service Book* (1931). But all of the marks of Maxwell's work are evident here—lucid prose, careful (and sometimes critical) documentation, and a command of the subject which fits Maxwell as few others to attempt such a grand undertaking.

The book contains six chapters—I. The Early Worship of the Celts and Scots, II. Medieval Worship, III. The

Reformation of Worship, IV. Worship and the Covenants, V. Worship After the Restoration, and VI. The Renaissance of Worship. In the course of these chapters will be found descriptions of some of the important liturgies of the Western Church: the Roman Mass at the close of the fourth century, the conjecture being that Ninian introduced to Scotland "what he learned at Rome and Tours"; the Stowe Missal of the eighth to tenth centuries, the first liturgy to reflect Celtic usage; the Sarum Missal, to which the Medieval Church of Scotland increasingly conformed; the Book of Common Order, adopted by the General Assembly in 1562; and the Directory of Worship which the Westminster Assembly completed in 1644.

One cannot pray these liturgies, as they were intended. But neither does Maxwell leave them moribund on his pages. There are, for example, engaging descriptions of church buildings typical of the era in which each liturgy was being celebrated. And the author does not seem to have overlooked any detail of worship, either important or interesting—the hours of services, the celebrant's position at the altar or table, vestments, furnishings, etc. The forces of tradition, innovation and restoration are carefully followed as they affected the ordering of worship. Political influences upon the liturgy are also recorded—whether they were the policies of Queen Margaret, the eleventh century reformer of worship, or of the Stuarts of the seventeenth century, or the partisan sentiments of later Presbyterians who rejected the liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer and the Creed because they had become associated with episcopacy. Two of Maxwell's discussions are especially commendable—the abuses of late Medieval worship (pp. 37-42) and, in contrast, the characteristics of "the Strasbourgian and Calvinian, and following these the Scottish, reformation of worship" (pp. 49ff.).

Perhaps in a book so rich and full, one should not ask for more. But the essential element is missing. The doctrinal bases of the liturgy are never adequately treated, not even when

those bases change and with them, the liturgy itself. This book, then, is a history of the forms and settings of worship, with remarkably little attention to liturgical ideas.

Maxwell's assumption seems to be that there is a *structural integrity*—a continuity of the shape of the liturgy—according to which the history of worship ought to be written and judgments made. On the contrary, the mark of Reformed worship was its *doctrinal integrity*. Bucer and Calvin, the fathers of that tradition, were not primarily concerned to preserve the classical structure of the liturgy. They were bent upon making worship biblically and theologically explicit, the classical structure notwithstanding. And so, for all its excellence, Maxwell's book needs to be supplemented by, say, Van de Poll's *Martin Bucer's Liturgical Ideas* and Wallace's *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament*.

Along with Maxwell's presuppositions goes the subtle tendency to arrive at the nature of Reformed worship by the process of defending it against so-called "evangelical" critics. Thus, in answer to the irate opponent of "read prayers," Maxwell recalls that the Reformers issued service-books (p. 53) and quotes Calvin in favor of "form" (p. 72). And so on, until the impression is left that the classical Reformed tradition was, after all, structurally sound and "liturgical." This curiously unhistorical approach to the nature of Reformed worship allows some conclusions to be drawn which vitiate the ideas of the Reformers. It tends to confirm the mistaken notion that the norm of Reformed worship is structural; and thus it accelerates the inclusion of any trapping that can be proved to be classical, whether it is theologically responsible or not.

If Maxwell fails to elucidate the real, the doctrinal bases for liturgical recovery in the Reformed tradition, he also fails to explain what is our liturgical plight in the light of history. The radical departure from the Reformation pattern, which James H. Nichols has called the "flattening out of Reformed worship," began in the seventeenth and extended well into the nineteenth cen-



ture. Though the conception of his book affords Maxwell a splendid opportunity to interpret this era (the history of which he gives in detail), he does not sufficiently uncover our heritage to expose our presuppositions and prejudices.

BARD THOMPSON  
*Vanderbilt Divinity School*

*The Church in Soviet Russia.* By MATTHEW SPINKA. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. 179 pp. \$3.25.

In 1918, the then Patriarch of the Russian Church cursed the Soviet authorities and called upon the Orthodox faithful "not to commune with outcasts of the human race in any manner whatsoever." At his enthronization in 1945, the present Patriarch of the Church, having earlier assured Josef Stalin of his "feelings of deep love and gratitude," embraced and thrice exchanged kisses with the Soviet Minister for Orthodox Church Affairs. The chronology of this debasement of the Church is Dr. Spinka's subject-matter.

*The Church in Soviet Russia* (perhaps an inexact title) traces the various and tortured policies adopted toward the Soviet regime by the three men who have, successively, headed the Church since the Bolshevik Revolution, Patriarchs Tikhon, Sergei, and Alexei. This narrative is a somber one, as it unfolds, in the author's words, the history of a "gradual but inevitable subordination of the Church to the state in a manner not only resembling the worst days of tsarism but far exceeding them." Dr. Spinka's careful and sober scholarship yields new insights concerning the cloudy question of Church-State relationships in the USSR, and is especially rewarding as it examines the personal character of the three Patriarchs and the enormity of the policy dilemmas which crowded in upon them.

One misses, however, the fullness of analysis which marked the author's earlier work on Berdyaev. One wishes

that Dr. Spinka had not held so closely to description, but had, in particular, explored and discussed much more fully the possible reasons, as he saw them, behind certain fundamental developments in Church-State relationships: Tikhon's change, in 1918 or 1919, from hostility to a more neutral position with respect to the Soviet regime; Tikhon's call, in 1925, for the rendering, in Spinka's words, of "steadfast loyalty to the Soviet government"; and Stalin's "Great Retreat" of the 1930's, wherein he shifted from an evident attempt to destroy the Church to a policy of making it an adjunct of the State.

To this reviewer, however, the principal question raised in the Church's history, and in Dr. Spinka's examination of it, is that of how a beleaguered Church is to interpret, and react to, the Apostle Paul's admonition to submit to the lawful government. The Russian Church has chosen explicitly and literally to follow Paul. By so doing, it has, like the Abbé Siéyès, "survived the Revolution." Has it, thus, best fulfilled its Christian witness? Or should the Church have made some other interpretation of Paul, stood firm against Moscow, and, possibly, suffered extinction? Spinka clearly leans, throughout the book, toward the literal Pauline position, holding (p. 46) that "The Church, after all, is above politics, and must not make itself into a last ditch stronghold of any political system." We in America, not having been faced with this unknowable and profound dilemma of the Russian Patriarchs, cannot pass judgment upon the Russian Church, and perhaps must bow to the author's wide knowledge, and judgment, of this question. Yet, one cannot but wonder if the Russian Church's resistance and even martyrdom might possibly have served the Divine Imperative more faithfully than has the Church's survival—at the cost, veritably, of its soul.

HAROLD P. FORD

*Davidson College*  
*Davidson, North Carolina*

How a great school helped shape  
the mind of the American Nation

# Yale and the Ministry

By ROLAND KINGTON

For two and a half centuries Yale and Southern New England were in a unique community. In Yale was the Ministry, the training ground where men of the book to influence the destinies of many of the men whose pioneering theological and social ideas shaped the thinking of the whole nation—Charles Butler, Jonathan Edwards, Lyman and Henry Ward Beecher, Horace Bushnell, Samuel Jackson, Nathaniel M. Taylor, the Channing Deacons and many others.

From this true history to, in effect, a history of Yale University through the ministry's history. It is a history of a demonstration of the fruitful responsibility of the great great school of thought, piety and social concern.

"A superb contribution to the literature of American history . . . and knowledge is enriched by an exciting story for the interest fact and the telling phrase."

—*Review of American Literature*

Published by the University of Chicago Press, 505 North Dearborn Street, Chicago 12, Ill.

*all the earmarks of a modern classic.*

International Journal of Religious Education

## History of Christianity 1850-1950

JOHN MARSHALL MCKENZIE, *Divinity School and  
Federated Theological Faculty, University of Chicago*

A perspective study of the transformation of the West, this book examines the changing relation of the Christian faith to society, culture, and the state from the Treaty of Westphalia to the present day. The events and tendencies of four great cultural and religious divisions—namely the Latin and Roman Catholic, the Germanic and Lutheran, the Orthodox Greek and Greek, and the English-speaking United denominations. The younger Christian in non-European cultures also receive critical treatment. 490 pp. \$5.50

"Dr. McKenzie shows the course of the life of the Christian Church with a precision and detail which enables students of not only the history of the Church but of the culture of the Western world." — *Religious Literature*

Published by the University of Chicago Press

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS • 505 N. Dearborn St., Chicago 12, Ill.

HYMN 100  
[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]

HYMN 100  
[Illegible text]

[Illegible text]